Library of The Theological Seminary

PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY

◆

Gift of
the
Green Fund
September 1878

BT 265 .S64~~7~~8 1859
Smith, John Pye, 1774-1851.
Four discourses on the
sacrifice and priesthood of

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

https://archive.org/details/fourdiscourseson00smit

FOUR DISCOURSES

ON THE

SACRIFICE AND PRIESTHOOD

OF

JESUS CHRIST,

AND THE

ATONEMENT AND REDEMPTION

THENCE ACCRUING:

WITH

Supplementary Notes and Illustrations.

BY

JOHN PYE SMITH, D.D., F.R.S.

AUTHOR OF "THE SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY TO THE MESSIAH," ETC.

FOURTH EDITION.

EDINBURGH: WILLIAM OLIPHANT AND CO.
LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

MDCCCLIX.

O unexampled love!
Love nowhere to be found less than divine.
Hail, Son of God, Saviour of men! Thy name
Shall be the copious matter of my song
Henceforth: and never shall my harp thy praise
Forget, nor from thy Father's praise disjoin.

MILTON

MURRAY AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

PREFACE

TO THE EDITION OF 1828.

The first of the following Discourse was delivered as a Sermon, at a monthly Lecture of Protestant Dissenting Ministers, in the year 1813; and was published at the request of my brethren in the ministry who had heard it, and who were pleased to express the hope that it might be of some use in the confirmation of a great branch of Christian truth. It is now republished, in compliance with repeated requests from valued friends in England and Scotland. In revising the Discourse with this view, I could not satisfy myself to lay before the public a mere reprint. Many thoughts appeared to admit of being more fully developed, or pursued to further consequences. These objects I have attempted to accomplish, partly by interspersed additions, but principally in the Three Discourses now annexed to the former one, and in the Supplementary Notes.

A discussion of the Sacrifice of our Blessed Redeemer could not but include some reference to his office and action as a PRIEST, "when he offered up himself." Such reference had been already made, in the original form of the First Discourse. To give the subject that further scope which would be suitable to its greatness, and especially to present a view of the rich contents of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in relation to this glorious theme, clearly demanded a separate Discourse.

SACRIFICE, in its most general idea, is a provision of the Divine Wisdom, in order that the manner of conferring mercy may make the deepest impression of the evil of sin and the guilt of the transgressor. Hence it cannot be even superficially studied, without involving an attention to the nature, reasons, and moral operation of a compensative arrangement, by which the restoration of the sinner may be effected without detriment to the public righteousness of the Most High.

ATONEMENT, therefore, or RECONCILIATION, or SATISFACTION, is a provision for guarding the laws of eternal wisdom; so that the goodness of the Divine Government may sustain no disparagement, in receiving transgressors to favour, and in conferring upon them the richest benefits of benevolence.

REDEMPTION is the effect of Atonement, as it is brought to bear upon the moral and relative state of the sinner.

To place these momentous subjects in a clear point of view, to show their solid foundations in the nature of things and the revealed authority of God, to preclude objections by anticipating their grounds, and to render the convictions of the understanding effectual as lessons to the heart; have been my desire and aim. May the Spirit of grace vouchsafe to grant his blessing!

It is an unwelcome necessity which, at any time, leads to a departure from the exact words of our authorized translation, in making citations from the Bible: but such a necessity, I have conceived, lay upon me; first, in order to place the English reader, as much as possible, in a capacity of forming his own judgment, equal to that which those enjoy who can consult the original texts; and secondly, because it appeared to be a duty to produce the testimonies of the sacred word in what I conscientiously believe to be their native meaning and unaltered force, as nearly as the idioms of different languages and remote times will permit. The reasons for deviating from the established translation will usually show themselves to the scholar. In those instances where they might not be obvious, they are accounted for in the Notes. As the object was to convey, in the most brief and direct manner, that which appears to me *the genuine meaning*, it has been sometimes necessary to use turns of expression a little paraphrastic; and occasionally to insert supplementary words. Such supplements every person, who is accustomed to translating, perfectly knows to be unavoidable, for transfusing into one language the true sense of terms and phrases in another.[1]

---

[1] "The expediency grows every day more and more evident, of setting forth the Holy Scriptures, for public use, to better advantage than as they appear in the present English translation. As to the style and language, it admits but of little improvement: but in respect of the *sense* and the *accuracy of interpretation*, the improvements of which it is capable, are *great* and *numberless*."—*Bishop* LOWTH'S *Isaiah; Prelim. Disc.* page 72.

PREFACE

TO THE EDITION OF 1842.

THIS volume is republished, in compliance with many requests and even remonstrances against hesitation. Immediate duties and hindrances have occasioned a long delay. The author has subjected the whole to a careful revision. In the Discourses, he has found no reason for alteration; but he has made considerable additions to the Notes.

The subjects of these Four Discourses closely cohere. In the author's conviction, they are no other than an unfolding of the characteristic doctrine of the gospel, its very heart and essence, the first principles of the Apostolic Church, "CHRIST, THE CRUCIFIED;"—the capital truth of theology and religion, which it was the glory of the Protestant Reformation to hold up to the world with accumulated evidence. From the descendants of the Reformers, to an awful extent, that glory has departed. Arianism and Pelagianism, Remonstrantism and Socinianism, the Unitarianism of England, the Antisupernaturalism and Pantheism of

Germany, have beat with all their forces against this rock: IN VAIN. It stands and will stand for ever.

In another way, the old Antichristian enmity has risen up. Among the portentous signs of our times is the effort of some men who dishonour a venerable University, to poison the fountains, and to bring in "the man of sin, with his detestable enormities." Their cool audacity and bad faith towards the Church of England, whose children they call themselves while they are forming a gangrene in her vitals, is equalled by their artifice in keeping silence under the many refutations of their sophistry and unmasking of their jesuitry, which have been published by both Churchmen and Dissenters, in England, Ireland, and America. That affectation is no proof of security, or of sincerity: it rather warrants the suspicion of a heart ill at ease, dark doubts and a bad conscience lurking within.

Whatever tribulations may arise, from the oppositions to gospel truth, we need not fear. The faithful will "overcome, by the blood of the Lamb and the word of their testimony."

God, of his infinite mercy grant, that he who writeth, and they who read these lines, may rightly appropriate the cheering yet awful words!—Should we "suffer trouble as evil-doers,—yet the word of God is not bound.—The salvation which is in

Christ Jesus, with eternal glory.—It is a faithful saying: For if we die with him, we shall also live with him: if we suffer, we shall also reign with him: if we deny him, he will also deny us: if we believe not, yet HE abideth faithful: he cannot deny himself.—Nevertheless, the foundation of God standeth sure."

In this fourth edition of the first Discourse, and third of the remaining three, the author has found nothing to retract or even to modify. Some additional clauses and paragraphs are interspersed, which he hopes will be useful. He has also added an *Appendix*, in reply to the *Letters* of the Rev. George Vance Smith.

J. P. S.

Homerton College,
Oct. 27, 1846.

CONTENTS.

DISCOURSE I.

ON THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

PART I. ON THE NATURE AND DESIGN OF THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

PAGE

I. General Nature of Sacrifices 19

On the Origin of the Ancient Rite of Sacrifice . . 20, 24

II. That it was a Symbolical Action 22

i. That Sacrifices had a designed Significancy . . 23, 28

ii. The Sentiments signified by them . . . 27

The Priestly Function 29

III. Application of the preceding Reasonings to the Sacrifice of Christ 31

i. That the Ancient Sacrifices were intended to represent the Great Work for which the Messiah was expected . 31

1. Proofs from the Jewish Scriptures . . . 31

2. Proofs from the New Testament 40

3. Argument from the Cessation of the Levitical Sacrifices 41

ii. That the Objects, of which the Ancient Sacrifices were only declarative, were really effected by the Sacrifice of Christ 42

1. Manifestation of important truths respecting the Perfections and Government of God 42

PAGE
2. That Jesus Christ sustained the Punishment of Sin . 45
Yet not as personally criminal 50
3. The Sacrifice of Christ considered as a Satisfaction to the public Honour of the Divine Government . . 53
The case absolutely peculiar 57

PART II. ON THE PROPER VALUE OF THE REDEEMER'S SACRIFICE.

I. The Person offering the Sacrifice in the capacity of Priest 61
II. The Subject of the Sacrifice 64
III. The Circumstance which confers its proper Value on this Great Sacrifice 66
The Relation of the Sufferings of Christ to his Divine Nature 67

PART III. ON THE EFFICACY OF THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

I. Removal of Obstructions to the Legal and Honourable Exercise of Divine Mercy 70
II. Foundation of the Overtures of Reconciliation in the Gospel 71
III. Assurance of the Holiness and Happiness of all who cordially acquiesce in this Method of Grace . . 74
This doctrine, the Centre of Christianity . . 76

DISCOURSE II.

ON THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.

I. Appellations of Jesus Christ, relating to this Office:—
Priest.—Great Priest.—High Priest.—Messenger.—Minister of the Sanctuary.—The Lord.—The Sanctifier.—Brother.—Surety.—Mediator.—Author.—Saviour.—Intercessor.—Forerunner.—Shepherd.—Son of God.—Accumulation of Terms of Dignity . 79–121

PAGE
II. Characteristic Properties of this Office :—
Sole.—Perfect.—Matured by Death.—Ever valid.—Productive of the most glorious effects.—The Gospel annunciation certified.—Reward to the Saviour.—Reconciliation (Expiation, Propitiation).—Entitling to all blessings.—Rendering fit to be presented to the Infinite Majesty.—Heaven saved from dishonour 121–141
Application to the case between man and God . . 127
Recapitulation 141
Observations :—
i. On the Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews . 144
ii. On the Error of regarding our Lord's Priesthood as figurative 145
iii. On the falsely called Rationalist System of Bible Interpretation 147
iv. The Tendency of that System to Infidelity and Atheism 155

DISCOURSE III.

ON THE ATONEMENT MADE BY CHRIST.

The Divine Moral Government 158
The Spirit of the Moral Law 159
The Ten Commandments 160
Ground and Reason 161
Nature and Distributions of Holiness 165
Nature and State of Sin 166
The Essential Principle of Happiness 167
Happiness destroyed by Sin 168
Law not susceptible of Relaxation 171
Obligations to Obedience 171
Disobedience ; its relation to the Deity . . . 171
Effects of violated Obligation 173
The Justice of the Divine Government . . . 173
Punishment, Natural and Positive 175
Depravity and Guilt of the Human Race . . . 177
The Conceivable Results of the Moral Condition of Man . 178
A Compensative and Mediatorial System . . . 179

DISCOURSE IV.

ON THE REDEMPTION EFFECTED BY CHRIST.

PAGE
The Language of Scripture, analogical . . . 181
Meaning of Terms 181
Equity, the fundamental Idea of all the Analogies . . 185
Twofold obligation of a sinful Creature . . . 188
Subjugation to the Tyranny of superior depraved Spirits . 188
Propriety of the Metaphors derived from cancelling a Debt and paying a Ransom 192

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

I. John David Michaelis on the Early Notions of Sacrifice 197
II. Human Sacrifices 201
III. Socinian Views of the Sacrifice of Christ . . 204
IV. Origin of Sacrifices 204
V. Skins of Animals, immediately after the Fall, converted into Clothing 214
VI. Heathen Notions of the Intention of Sacrifices . 215
VII. Doctrine of the Pythagoræans and Platonists . 218
VIII. Religious Instruction by the Levites . . 219
Winer's Description of the Levitical Sacrifices . 220
IX. The Crowned Priest and King in Zechariah . . 234
X. Passages of the New Testament referring to Isaiah liii. 237
XI. Objections of Dr Gesenius to the Christian Interpretation of Isaiah liii.; and Replies to them . . 240
XII. Five Translations of Isaiah liii. . . 249–257
XIII. The Philosophy of Causation, favourable to the Christian Doctrine of Redemption . . . 258
XIV. On the term *Guilt,* in imputation to Christ . . 260
XV. Evasion of Scriptural Language on the Sufferings of Christ 260
XVI. On the term *Satisfaction* 262
XVII. On the term SAVIOUR 264
XVIII. On the Socinian Assertion that Christ had to offer for himself 266

PAGE
XIX. On the words ETERNAL SPIRIT . . . 270
XX. On the Reading and Interpretation of 1 Tim. iii. 16 271
XXI. On the Doctrine of the Deity of Christ . . 272
XXII. On the Extent of the Atonement . . . 273
Sketch of the Coincidences and Differences between Archbishop *Magee's* Work on Atonement and Sacrifice, and the First of these Discourses . 280
XXIII. Dr John Ryland on the Reasonableness of Christ's Mediation 282
XXIV. On the Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews . 285
XXV. On the Connexion of the Ideas of Ransom and Atonement 293
XXVI. Michaelis on the Peculiarity of our Lord's Sufferings 295
The Original of the Passage at page 16 . . 302

APPENDIX, referring to the Letters of Mr Vance Smith . 303

INDICES 327

PASSAGE FROM THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS.

"When the measure of our iniquities was filled up, and it was perfectly manifest that now the retribution, even punishment and death, was alone to be expected; the time came which God had predetermined, for the manifestation of the goodness and power so surpassingly his own: so that his sole love, from a kindness to man exceeding all thought, [has wrought this work of grace.] He has not branded you with his hatred, nor cast you off, nor remembered your wickedness; but in his long-suffering and forbearance he has said, 'he bare our sins.' Himself hath given his own Son, a ransom-price for us, the Holy One for the transgressors, the Innocent for the wicked, the Righteous for the unrighteous, the Immortal for the mortal. For what, but his righteousness, could cover our sins? In whom was it possible that we, transgressors and ungodly, could be justified, but in the Son of God alone? O delightful substitution! O unsearchable work! O beneficence beyond all expectation! That the iniquity of the many should be lost in the Righteous One, and the righteousness of the One should justify the many transgressors! Thus, then, in the time past, God hath demonstrated the impossibility that our nature should [by its own powers] obtain life; and now he hath displayed the Saviour, who is able to save, contrary to [all human] possibility. In both he hath declared his will, that we should trust in his goodness; and account Him our Nourisher, our Father, our Teacher, our Counsellor, our Healer, our Understanding, our Light, our Honour, our Glory, our Strength, our Life."

From the Epistle to *Diognetus*, by an unknown author, preserved in the works of *Justin Martyr*, ed. Paris, 1636, p. 500. Lardner calls it "an excellent epistle." Tillemont attributes it to the first century. Prof. Olshausen (in his *Hist. Eccl. Vet. Monum. Præcip.* Berlin, 1822) says that the author must certainly have lived near the time of the apostles.

The reader will do well to consult Dr Bennett's remarks on this Epistle and its author, in his *Congregational Lecture* on *The Theology of the Early Christian Church*, London, 1841; Sect. I. "No Christian scholar," says Dr Bennett, "can read it without being inspired with a profound veneration for its author, as a noble specimen of the genuine primitive disciples of Christ."

For the satisfaction and benefit of many readers, the original text is inserted at the end of this volume, page 302.

DISCOURSE I.

ON THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

HEBREWS IX. 14.

—THE BLOOD OF CHRIST, WHO THROUGH THE ETERNAL SPIRIT, OFFERED HIMSELF WITHOUT SPOT TO GOD.

In immediate importance, and in relation to all the parts of the Christian system, there is no doctrine that has a higher claim upon attention than the Sacrifice which the Scriptures attribute to our blessed Redeemer. It is a principal and solid ground for the whole body of instruction and precept, admonition and consolation, to the erection of which, under the divine blessing, all the labours of the gospel ministry are devoted. On this foundation safely rest our acceptance with the Judge of all, our gratitude and holy obedience, our dearest hopes, and our immortal expectations. How happy shall I be, if the condescending grace of God shall render the attempt to establish and enforce this interesting subject, effectual to the confirmation in holiness, and to the salvation, of him that writes, and of those who read: and then it will assuredly be to God's own eternal praise!

The text is a part of the argument which the sacred writer pursues to a large extent, in order to show that the sacrifices and other ceremonies of the Israelitish law had no intrinsic value, nor any efficacy in themselves to redeem a sinner from the consequences of his guilt before the tribunal of Heaven, or to remove from his own mind the melancholy consciousness of its pollution and misery. But, though they were inefficient for these purposes, they had a utility, highly beneficent, and worthy of the wisdom which ordained them. They were intended as a system of emblematical instruction, whose striking and intelligible symbols should point out the true and only way in which sinful man can receive the saving mercy of God. "The law made nothing perfect, but was the introduction of a better hope,—the shadow of good things to come,—and could never, with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. The first tabernacle was a figure for the time then present:—but Christ being come, the High Priest of those good things which were [at that time] future, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is, not of this creation; and not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption. For if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctified to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God?"

That, in some sense, Christ offered a sacrifice, will be disputed by no believer in Christianity. Our object is to ascertain the true meaning of the expression, and the objects to which it has reference. The inquiry, therefore, will be directed to the Nature, the Value, and the Efficacy of the Sacrifice attributed in Scripture to our Lord Jesus Christ.

PART I.

ON THE NATURE AND DESIGN OF THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

I. It will be necessary to premise some remarks on the general nature of the ancient sacrifices, and the matters of fact or the positions in doctrine which were connected with them.

A SACRIFICE, properly so called, is the solemn infliction of death on a living creature, generally by effusion of its blood, in a way of religious worship; and the presenting of this act to the Deity, as a supplication for the pardon of sin, and a supposed mean of compensation for the insult and injury thereby offered to his majesty and government.

The practice of offering sacrifices to the true God, or to fictitious divinities, is known to have been a custom, in the most complete sense, universal and ancient.[1] The records of the early history of nations, and the narratives of modern discovery, equally show the prevalence of sacrificial rites, in all countries where they have not been superseded by Christianity. The manner in which men performed those rites showed their strong apprehension of importance and interest in them. The inferior and less serviceable animals were not generally devoted to this purpose; but the animals of most utility to man were the usual sacrifices, and these often in large and costly numbers. Such profusion proved the serious earnestness of those who used it: yet, in instances without number, more horrid proofs were given. On great occasions of terror, or of expectation, human beings were the victims of this dire immolation. Unhappy and bewildered mortals have sought relief from the pangs of guilty dread, and have hoped to atone for past crimes by committing others still more awful: they have given their first-born for their transgression, the fruit of their body for the sin of their soul.[1]

---

[1] Supplementary Note I. at the end of this volume.

The remote antiquity of these observances is attested by the most venerable remains of classical and oriental composition; and the most ancient and authentic of documents, the sacred history, carries them back to the first family of man.

It is the opinion of some, that, in allusion and accommodation to those practices, and with a view to facilitate the reception of Christianity by gratifying the prejudices of the Jews, the New Testament represents Jesus Christ as having offered a sacrifice to God; though, in a real and proper sense, he did no such thing. These interpreters affirm that, as the Jews had a profound veneration for their temple, their priesthood, and their altar, the first Christian teachers endeavoured to ingratiate themselves and procure acceptance to their system, by finding in it likewise a priest, a sacrifice, and an altar.[2] To this mode of representation we object that, as an hypothesis, it is defective, and that it is contrary to the testimony of Scripture.

It is defective, as an hypothesis, in that it leaves the previous fact unaccounted for; the existence of sacrifices, their origin, and their design. An attempt is made to remove the difficulty, by alleging that the worship by sacrifices "was of the nature of a present, by way of homage to the Supreme Being."[3] On this supposition, must we not deem the bloodless, innocent, and more natural offering of Cain, the fruits of the earth, more rational in itself, and more likely to be agreeable to the

[1] Supplementary Note II. [2] Supplementary Note III.

[3] Dr Priestley's Notes on Scripture, Vol. i. p. 13.

Deity, than that of Abel, which appears revolting to the feelings of humanity, a useless waste of animal life, and, as an act of worship, manifestly absurd? But, passing by the grossness of the invention, what conceptions must those form of the blessed God, who imagine that with such services He could be gratified?

We also object that this notion is inconsistent with the plain language of the Scriptures, in regard both to the ancient sacrifices, and to the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. Evidence for both the parts of this remark we shall presently submit to the reader's judgment.

A doctrine, the reverse of that to which we have referred, appears to us the dictate of the divine oracles and of impartial reason. This is, that the ancient sacrifices were themselves only *allusions;* and that they were intended as a REPRESENTATION of the sufferings and death of the Messiah, or as a DECLARATION of the doctrine included in that grand future fact, and taught by it.

In the communication of knowledge from man to man, the living voice is a very imperfect instrument. The extent of its use is narrowly circumscribed by infirmity and death. The advantages of man's primitive longevity were opposed by prevailing and increasing corruption; and practical wickedness must in time have effaced right impressions of religious truth. The tongues of patriarchs and prophets were soon silent in the grave; and the mere memory of their instructions, however for a time affectionately cherished, was a hazardous channel of communication for truths of infinite concern. Hence a *language of mute signs* must have appeared to possess inestimable advantages, as soon as the idea of such an instrument was entertained. Such a representative of language might be of two kinds, the *symbolical* and the *arbitrary.* The latter kind is alphabetical writing: an admirable contrivance, whether it was entirely the fruit of human ingenuity, or, as some have supposed, originating in divine communication. It is probable, that the first extensive use of this invention nearly coincided with the considerable increase of population, and the reduction of the length of human life to its present standard. The brevity, ease, and universal application of this method, have given it an almost exclusive prevalence among the cultivated nations which have been founded to the west of the original seats of the human race.

But we have reason to think, that a more remote antiquity may be claimed for the other kind of signs, the *symbolical.* This was a system of natural significancy, in which visible objects or their pictures, and actions performed with this express design, were used to represent and convey information. This plan was prevalent in the earliest periods, and among the most ancient nations. Even at this day, a written language, which is understood by about one-third of the human race, is of this description: the Chinese. It is founded upon the principle of employing characters, not as representatives of sounds, but as types or symbols of ideas; and it is familiarly understood by nations whose spoken dialects differ greatly.

II. Of this kind we conceive the rite of sacrifice to have been; a *symbolical action*, adapted and intended to convey important instruction. We shall offer our reasons for regarding sacrifices as thus intentionally significant; and then shall inquire into the particular ideas and moral sentiments which were so represented.

i. Our arguments in favour of the notion that sacrifices were intended as a species of symbolical language, will be drawn from their very Nature and Form, from their Origin, and from the Sentiments of those who practised them.

1. The nature, form, and circumstances of a sacrifice carried an obvious import upon their very first aspect. The selection, presentation, and immolating of the unoffending animal, the regard paid to its blood, its consumption by fire, the solemn ceremonies which accompanied, and the particular confessions and supplications of the worshipper,—must have powerfully impressed the ideas of sin and guilt, the desert of punishment, the substitution of the innocent, and the pardon of the transgressor. When men were accustomed to symbolical actions, such a significancy would be more readily apprehended and more solemnly felt, than under our circumstances and habits. The refinements of advanced society, and the general use of letters, have made us far less sensible to the language of living signs than the ruder children of nature have always been. How much more must the impression on the heart have been increased, when *the first* sacrifice was offered: when the parents of our race, recent from their guilty fall, were abased by the divine rebuke, driven from their blissful seat, and filled with dismay at the threatening of DEATH! A threatening piercing through their souls, but of the nature and effects of which they could form none but vague ideas.[1] But when, directed by stern authority, to apply some instrument of death to the lamb which, with endearing innocence, had sported around

---

[1] Such a deficiency and obscurity of conception may very well be supposed to have existed in the minds of our first parents, notwithstanding the unquestionable facts that the animate creation, in all previous states of the earth, had been often devoured by other animals; and that the creatures contemporary with Adam were also formed to be the subjects of the law of death. Those first human beings might not have continued long enough in the state of sinlessness, to have had opportunities of becoming acquainted with the phenomena of death. Yet our argument is not impaired, it is even strengthened, by admitting that they were more than obscurely aware of what would be the consequences of violating the command of their Maker.

One may here also offer a remark upon the impropriety of the notion, that them,—an act of whose effects they as yet knew nothing,—they heard its unexpected cries, they beheld the appalling sight of streaming blood, and struggling agonies, and life's last throes,—they gazed upon the breathless body,—and they were told, THIS IS DEATH:—how stricken must they have been with horror such as no description could ever paint! When, further, they had to go through all the other process of the sacrifice, their hands reluctant, and their hearts broken, and all their soul crushed down by the sad consciousness that these horrid things were the fruit of their sin, and yet contained the hope of their deliverance;—who can imagine the extremity of their feelings?

2. The origin of sacrifices we have good reason to regard as from Heaven, and not of men. In the institutes of the Levitical law, the express divine sanction is indisputable: and if we go back to the remotest times, we shall find indications of the same authority. The approbation of God is solemnly recorded to the sacrifices of Job and Abraham, Noah and Abel. But, in religious institutions, the Most High has ever been jealous of his prerogative. He alone is competent to prescribe the terms on which he will hold communion with sinful beings; and he regards as vain and presumptuous, every pretence of honouring him which he hath not warranted. The sacrifice of blood and death, if an idea so revolting could have sprung up in a sinner's mind, could not have been offered to God without impiety, nor would he have accepted it, had not

---

the forbidden fruit was an *apple.* By this assumption, profane and infidel jesting has been encouraged. In fact, we cannot know of what species or genus the tree was. It is self-evident that, in order that the command might answer its purpose of being a *test of simple deference to authority*, it must have related to some act or omission which had the appearance of being *in itself* indifferent. If the fruit of the tree was intoxicating, unnaturally exciting, or otherwise pernicious (as is probable); that would make no difference, unless such properties were made known to the subjects of the precept.

his own authority previously pointed the way by an explicit prescription.[1]

The goodness which pitied our first parents, in their fallen and degraded condition, furnished them with clothing from the skins of animals. It cannot, by any reasonable presumption, be supposed that those animals had been killed for food. The strong probability, therefore, is that the gracious Being who promised the Messiah as the woman's seed, confirmed the promise, and illustrated the doctrine of forgiveness through him, by the institution of sacrifices.[2]

Now all divine institutions are marked by the wisdom of their Author. The sabbath, the passover, the rite of baptism, and all other ordinances of worship, are significant and instructive: it is fair to infer that sacrifices were so too.

3. The sentiments of those who practised sacrificial rites are in favour of our position.

The ancient heathens universally attributed to sacrifices both significancy and efficacy. The oldest representations of their sentiments and manners bear this testimony. Of the classical productions of the western nations, the works of Homer are the most ancient; and who, that has read his two exquisite poems, can be ignorant that by sacrifices, performed or promised, the gods were to be appeased, and the pardon of offences procured? The primitive idea of atonement, buried as it was under idolatrous corruptions, disgraced by superstitions, and polluted with atrocities, was not totally lost.[3] Some of the philosophers, disgusted with the vulgar notions, or shocked at the apparent absurdity of a practice, the meaning and intent of which they knew not, expressed their surprise and disapprobation at so strange a mode of seeking the favour of the Deity: but tradition, uniting with the consciousness of guilt and the dread of punishment, had fixed the notion and practice in the minds of all nations too strongly to be eradicated by philosophical speculations. It was a doctrine held even by some of the Pythagoreans, that the purification of the soul, and its union with God, were effected by sacrifices and sacrificial fire.[1]

---

[1] Supplementary Note IV.

[2] Supplementary Note V.

[3] Supplementary Note VI.

The modern Jews, though their aversion from Christianity had led them, in various important points, to abandon the theology of their ancestors, have recognised statements on this subject which we may justly esteem valuable concessions. As a specimen of passages which might be adduced, the following is submitted to your attention from one of their most learned and approved writers, Isaac Abrabenel. "The blood of the offerer deserved to be shed, and his body to be burned, for his sin: only the mercy of the [Divine] Name accepted this offering from him as a substitute and propitiation, whose blood should be instead of his blood, and its life instead of his life."[2]

These inferior authorities are valuable, inasmuch as they may be regarded as the distant emanations of primitive truth, communicated at first by the Author of truth himself. To this high source let us carry our appeal. If, in his holy word, we find pointed declarations of the absolute inefficacy of the legal sacrifices, except connected with moral acts and dispositions; declarations addressed to the people whom he had commanded thus to worship him, and who could not neglect the observance without incurring his awful displeasure;—can we avoid the conclusion, that they were intended to inform the mind, and assist the faith, of the worshipper? Instances of such declarations in the

---

[1] Supplementary Note VII.

[2] Outram de Sacrif. p. 275.

Old Testament are obvious. "For what purpose to me is the multitude of your sacrifices? saith Jehovah. I am disgusted with the burnt-offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts: and in the blood of bulls and lambs and goats I delight not." "I hate, I despise your festivals; and I will not accept the odour [of sacrifices and incense] on your solemn days. Though ye present to me sacrifices and offerings, I will not accept them."—"Sacrifice and offering thou desirest not:—burnt-offering and sacrifice for sin thou dost not require."[1]

By these considerations it appears satisfactorily established that the intention and use of the ancient sacrifices was to be a SIGNIFICANT REPRESENTATION of spiritual and important truth, and that in this view they were understood by those who practised them.

ii. We have next to inquire, WHAT truths were displayed in this symbolical language.

Let us in imagination view the striking scenery of a patriarchal or a Levitical sacrifice. A victim is selected, the best of the flock or the herd, without blemish or defect. It is brought before the altar of the Lord; its owner lays his hand upon its head; its life's blood flows upon the ground; it is divided, and burned with fire;—while the conscious sinner sees his own desert, and prays,—"Now, O Lord, I have sinned, I have committed iniquity, I have rebelled: thus and thus have I done. But I return in repentance to thy presence; and be this my expiation!"[2]

Could it have been difficult to perceive the solemn meaning of this significant action? Or was it possible for a serious and thinking mind to avoid recognising and deeply feeling principles such as these?—That *sin* is an offence against the blessed God, most heinous in its evil nature, aggravated in its inseparable though varying circumstances, and absolutely insufferable before his holy presence :—that the essential righteousness of Jehovah renders it necessary and inevitable that sin should be *punished*:—that *death*, in all its tremendous meaning and extent, is the proper punishment of sin: —that the sinner is totally *unable*, by any powers or resources of his own, to escape the punishment due to his offence :—yet that God is full of *mercy*, and graciously willing to pardon the guilty offender :—that the way of pardon is through the *substitution* and sufferings of a piacular victim :—and that, on the part of the suitor for pardoning mercy, there must be such a *proprietorship* in the victim as to create a beneficiary interest; and such a *moral disposition* as cordially acquiesces in the punitive acts of divine justice.[1]

---

[1] Isa. i. 11. Amos v. 21. Ps. xl. 6.

[2] An ancient Jewish form, on sacrificial occasions; in Outram, p. 273.

In this solemn and affecting manner was it declared to ages and generations, that "God is the righteous

---

[1] I have great satisfaction in adding an elucidation and confirmation of these sentiments, by so distinguished an orientalist and biblical scholar as Sir John David Michaelis: and the passage is further valuable as giving a concise and luminous statement of the *purpose* intended to be answered by the most considerable parts of the ceremonial law.

"Gal. iii. 19. (Paraphrase.) *But*, it may be said, *still the law has been once given: what then is its object?* I answer; it was annexed till the coming of that descendant of Abraham to whom all the promises refer, in order to convince the people of Israel of their sins, and to remind them daily of their guilt.

"(Annotation.) It was the design of the Law of Moses to remind the Israelites, that they were guilty of sin and liable to death.

"1. Every *Sacrifice* was a memorial of this mournful truth. Sin was confessed over the head of the victim, and then it was slain. As it is certain that sin could not be taken away by the blood of bullocks or goats, this solemnity was no other than a memorial to the sinner, that his sin deserved death. On this account the apostle says, 'In the sacrifices—there is a remembrance of sins made again every year.'

"2. The Levitical law denounced the Israelites as *unclean*, on account of various inevitable circumstances. In particular, a human being could not be born into the world without his mother being thereby rendered unclean. Lev. xii.

"3. At no time were the Israelites allowed to have immediate *access to God*.

Judge, of purer eyes than to behold evil, and who cannot countenance iniquity; that his wrath is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men; that the wages of sin is death; that there is forgiveness with the Lord, and plenteous redemption; but that without the shedding of blood there is no remission."[1] Inseparably associated with a sacrifice were the character and function of the person offering it; whom we call the Priest. It were to be wished that our language had a term answering more correctly to the ancient words used for this purpose, and which denoted a *holy person transacting with God on the behalf of others.*[2] In the early times, the father of the family, and by the same reason the head of a clan, performed this duty for himself and on behalf of his dependants. Noah, Abraham, and Jacob were priests to their own households. Afterwards, the extension of the idea of patriarchal authority, and the importance of the office above all others, led it to be combined with the highest social dignity. In the early part of Abraham's life, the

---

Of the common Israelites, no one dared to enter into the most holy place, or even into the holy place. This 'place where God dwelt,' was closed against them. Their offerings could be accepted by God only when presented through the medium of the priest.

"4. Not all those creatures of God which had been granted for food to Noah, were allowed to be enjoyed by the Israelites. A great part were declared unclean, and the Israelites were therefore obliged to abstain from them.

"5. As the *eating* of the sacrifice was to be an image of the complete dedication of the sacrifice, and of the propitiation effected by it; and as the expiation was especially the effect of the blood; so the eating of the blood was absolutely prohibited (Lev. xvii. 11, 12), in order to indicate that, with all their offerings, a *real* expiation for their sins had not been made.

"From all this, it is apparent that the law was given to be a *declaration* of the guilt of sin, and *not to take it away.* For this reason it is called (2 Cor. iii. 7, 9) 'the ministry which denounceth death,—and condemnation:' and Paul says of it (Rom. iii. 20), 'By the law is the knowledge of sin;' and (v. 20) 'the law entered, that the offence might abound,' *i.e.* be shown to be so great." *Paraphrasis und Anmerkungen über die Br. an die Gal. Eph. u. s. w.* p. 26.

[1] Ps. vii. 11. Habak. i. 12. Rom. i. 18; vi. 23. Ps. cxxx. 4, 7. Heb. ix. 27.

[2] See the first paragraphs of Discourse II.

king of Salem, in whom we see that the knowledge and worship of the only God were not yet wholly supplanted among the heathen, was Melchisedec, "the priest of the Most High God." This combination of the offices took place also in remote periods of the history of idolatrous nations. In some instances by the constitution of the country, and in others by specific appointment, the same individual was both king and priest. The functions of the office included all religious worship and sacred rites; but the principal of them lay in offering solemn sacrifice to the Deity, whether acknowledged in truth or conceived of under false representations. This is plainly stated in the divine prescriptions concerning the priesthood among the Israelites. While the tribe of Levi generally were to perform numerous services, necessary to the public rites of religion, and therefore were priests in the wider sense of the term, it was but one family of that tribe which was permitted to offer sacrifice, the service of highest distinction; it was only "the seed of Aaron the priest that should come nigh, to present the offerings of the Lord made by fire." It was also an important part of the priest's duty, and which demonstrates the beneficial character of the office, to give religious instruction, and to determine controversies concerning the meaning and application of the divine law: and it may reasonably be supposed that this instruction, among the worshippers of the true God, and where there was a conscientious regard to his will and authority, would include so much as was understood of the moral intentions of sacrificial observances. When the Levitical priest faithfully answered to the design of his institution, "the law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips; he walked with God in peace and uprightness, and converted many from iniquity: for the priest's lips were bound to keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; for he was the messenger of Jehovah [and God] of Hosts."[1]

Thus we have briefly endeavoured to ascertain the design and use of the ancient rite of sacrifice, and the truths which it was suited to inculcate upon the understandings and moral feelings of those who celebrated it.

III. We proceed now to our principal object, the application of these facts and principles to the great work of our Lord Jesus Christ as a suffering Mediator, "offering himself without spot to God." Two subjects of serious attention lie before us: the first, to evince that the ancient sacrifices were designed representations of this work and office of Christ; and the second, to show that what they could only represent and teach, his sacrifice did truly and actually effect.

i. The ancient sacrifices were originally designed as symbols, emblems, and representations of the GREAT WORK for the effecting of which the MESSIAH was promised to fallen man.

1. In support of this proposition, our first article of evidence is deduced from explicit declarations of the Old Testament.

"Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not. A body hast thou prepared for me. Burnt-offering and sin-offering thou requirest not. Then said I, Lo, I come! In the volume of the book it is written of me: I delight to do thy will, O God; yea, thy law is within my heart."[2]

---

[1] Supplementary Note VIII.

[2] Ps. xl. 6–8. "A body hast thou prepared me." Heb. x. 5, and so read the LXX., and the Old Italic undoubtedly derived from it, the Æthiopic and a MS. of the Syriac at Paris. One in the Bodleian, and the Arabic Version in Walton, combine both readings. כָּרָה can hardly be made to signify *to bore.* It denotes primarily *to dig*, a well for instance, or a pit; and derivatively it is

The authority of the New Testament decides the application of this passage to the Messiah. The language of rejection applied to the legal offerings can be understood only as a strong denial of any intrinsic value or efficacy in them; for the command to offer those sacrifices was unquestionably binding upon the Hebrew nation, so long as the Levitical covenant continued in force. The leading idea in this distinguished passage manifestly is, that the Messiah should supersede all the sacrificial observances, by actually performing *that very requisite*, that good pleasure of Jehovah, which they were totally unable to accomplish. Now their known and avowed intention was "to make an atonement before the Lord, for the soul that had sinned, that it might be forgiven him for all that he had done. The blood—I have given to you, [to be offered] upon the altar, to make atonement for your souls; because it is the blood which maketh atonement for the soul."[1] But to this point they could never attain. For this, as considered separately from their declarative intention, HE that commanded them had no delight in them. *This*, therefore, must have been the object in which the divine complacency rested; this the grand purpose for which,

---

employed in the sense of *acquiring* or *preparing*. Deut. ii. 6; 2 Kings vi. 23; Job xl. 30 (English division, xli. 6); Hos. iii. 2. For אָזְנַיִם therefore I venture to read, with Kennicott, and approved by Dr Randolph, אָז גֵּוָה *then a body*, conjecturing the present reading to have come from those two words, by the similarity of letters. "The most common interpretation is, that the Psalmist alludes to the custom of boring the ears of a servant; Ex. xxi. 5, 6. But as such allusion is very obscure, and not warranted either by the context or by any good authority, so the Psalmist speaks of *ears* in the plural, whereas the servant had only one ear bored." *Randolph's Citations of the N. T.* (No. 159). J. A. H. Tittmann, however, and other good critics, conceive that the same ultimate sense comes out of the common reading, by reducing the figures to their proper signification; and that therefore the apostle put σῶμα as the explanation of ὠτία. *Opuscula Theol.* pp. 198-204. Leipz. 1803. Such also was the solution of our great countryman, Dr Owen.

[1] Lev. vi. 2, 7; xvii. 11.

in due time, the Messiah should be manifested;—"TO PUT AWAY SIN BY THE SACRIFICE OF HIMSELF."

"Jehovah hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec."[1] In this passage, which both ancient and modern Jews allow to be spoken of the Messiah, he is represented as being a priest, according to a constitution not depending on family descent, and far superior in dignity to that of Aaron and his descendants; as uniting in his person the regal and the priestly character; as deriving his office immediately from God; as having no successor in it; as exercising it in the most beneficent manner, dispensing righteousness, peace, and blessing; in a word, as being truly THE SON OF GOD to whom Melchisedec could sustain only a "likeness."

"He shall sit and rule upon his throne: even he shall be Priest upon his throne."[2] The Messiah is here foretold by the prophet, and represented by the faithful high-priest who presided in the building of the second temple, as to spring up, like a tender bud from the lowly plain, unnoticed by men; or like the day-spring from on high, gradually and surely advancing, till it is fully disclosed,—the Sun of Righteousness in his own eternal majesty. It is declared that he shall collect the scattered members of that spiritual temple, in which the Gentiles from the ends of the earth shall be happy and active members; while those to whom this promise was originally made, by their refusing to listen to the voice of God, and rejecting his counsels, will be cast out from that temple or state of religious privilege, whose advantages they had awfully abused. This series of acts displays their Author as a Sovereign exercising dominion and judicial authority. But in his righteousness grace also reigns: his royalty is exercised with mercy, and scope is afforded for this exaltation of mercy and grace, by a great expiation. He therefore is a PRIEST, while he rules as a King. But, according to the evidence before adduced, he cannot be a priest without a sacrifice. "For every high-priest is constituted for the offering of both gifts and sacrifices; whence it is necessary that this [High-Priest] should also have something which he may offer:"[1] and the superiority of his priesthood leads us justly to expect a correspondent dignity in the offering which he has to present.

---

[1] Ps. cx 4.

[2] Zech. vi. 13. Supplementary Note IX.

"Seventy weeks are determined with regard to thy people, and with regard to thy holy city, to restrain the rebellion and to put a complete end to the sin, and to make atonement for iniquity, and to introduce a righteousness [which shall be] for ages, and to put a complete end to vision and prophecy, and to consecrate a holy of holies [*i. e.* to redeem and devote to God, by the *anointing* of heavenly grace, the new Gospel church, the whole company of real believers]. Know, then, and deeply consider, [that] from the going forth of the [divine] word for the return and for the rebuilding of Jerusalem, to the Messiah the Leader, shall be seven weeks and sixty-two weeks. Thou shalt return, and it shall be rebuilt, both the street and the ruined wall, even in distressful times. And, after the sixty-two weeks the Messiah shall be cut off; and no one will be for him [*i. e.* to defend him from his murderous enemies]. And the people of a leader to come shall destroy both the city and the sanctuary: and its end shall be with an invasion, and to the end of the war desolations are determined. Also one week shall confirm the covenant with many; and half the week shall cause sacrifice and offering to cease. And upon the pinnacle shall be the abominations of desolation; and yet he will pour out the extirpation even determined upon the desolator."[1] This passage is cited thus at length, as a view of the whole is necessary to verify our construction of the clauses which apply to our present purpose. Its bearings on our subject are evident. It declares that the sacrifices and offerings once instituted by God should be abolished; that the Messiah should be given up to an untimely and violent death, though no personal demerit could be charged upon him; and that, by this great measure in the government and grace of God, a true propitiation and an everlasting righteousness should be established.

---

[1] Heb. viii. 3.

Direct your eyes now, my Christian brethren, to one of the brightest constellations in the prophetic hemisphere. That Jews, infidels, and persons bearing the Christian name but very questionable friends to the Christian cause, have denied the reference to the Messiah and to his sufferings, can excite no surprise in those who reflect that the most vital truths of revealed religion have always been the most eminently "a sign spoken against." But even the earliest Jewish exposition that we have (if we except the Septuagint version, which in the prophets generally, and especially in Isaiah, is disfigured with the marks of extraordinary carelessness, or ignorance of the prophet's language, or corruption), makes the application to the Messiah:[1] and the reason that subsequent Jewish writers have taken an opposite course, is plainly their resolution not to admit the claims of Jesus. The New Testament, in various places, quotes or alludes to the passage as testifying of the Messiah:[2] and the Christian writers, from the early fathers downwards, have received this interpretation as manifest and even self-evident; till recent times have exhibited men, under the guise of Christian teachers, who scruple not to regard themselves as better interpreters of the Scriptures than were Jesus and his apostles.[3]

---

[1] Dan. ix. 24–27. V. 24. Literally "anoint a holy of holies." In the first edition, I had understood this as describing the formal and proclaimed setting apart of Jesus to the Messiahship (Heb. v. 5–10, vii. 28); but as the expression does not in the Old Testament occur in application to any person, and was the established phrase for the inner and most holy part of the tabernacle or temple, I accede to the interpretation of Cocceius, Dathe, and Dr Stonard (in his valuable *Dissertation on the Seventy Weeks of Daniel*, p. 62, 277; London; 1825), applying the words to the constituting and devoting to God, by the Redeemer's sacrifice and grace, of the New Testament Church, the whole company of gospel believers (Eph. v. 25–27. 2 Cor. i. 21. Heb. x. 14).

V. 26. אֵין לוֹ "No one will be for him," to defend or deliver. I am convinced by what Dr Stonard has advanced, that the common rendering, *not for himself*, 'must be given up, as not reconcilable with the Hebrew idiom.' (*Diss.* p. 84.) Michaelis and Dathe prefer the reading דִּין לוֹ *he shall execute judgment*, elicited from the version of Theodotion, the one inserted in our Septuagints. But they, with Blaney, understand יַכְּרֵית actively, and explain the whole verse as describing the judgments of Christ upon the Jewish nation. Dr Stonard has, I think, shown that the preponderance of evidence is against them.

כָּלָה וְנֶחֱרָצָה "Extirpation even determined." The וְ must be taken as exegetical, not copulative; as is proved by the very phrase in Is. x. 23. See *Noldii Partic. Heb.* p. 287. Gesenius maintains the same, and refers it to the common Hebrew mode of Hendiadys: both his Lexicons.

But let us hear the distinguished portion itself, that we may judge whether its own evidence is not enough, with any candid and unprejudiced mind, to place the affirmative of the question above all rational doubt.

Isaiah lii. 13. "Behold, my servant shall be successful: he shall be exalted, and extolled, and be very high. 14. Though many are struck with astonishment at thee; his appearance is disfigured more than that of any man, and his form more than that of any of the children of men: 15. yet shall he consecrate many nations: kings shall keep silence before him; for what had not been related to them they shall see, and what they had not heard they shall understand.———liii. 1. (—Who believeth our declaration? And to whom is the arm of Jehovah revealed?—) 2. Yet he shall spring up as a tender shoot before them [*i. e.* the Jewish people], and as a root out of dry ground: he has no form nor beauty, that we should gaze at him; no appearance, that we should be delighted with him: 3. despised and neglected by men, a man of sorrows and familiar with sufferings, and like one who hideth his face from us [to bury his griefs in seclusion]; disdained; and we gave him no attention.

---

[1] This appears from the following sentences of the Targum, or Chaldee Paraphrase of Jonathan Ben Uzziel, which is attributed to the apostolic age. Chap. lii. 13. "Behold, my servant the Messiah shall act prosperously, shall be exalted, increased, and multiplied exceedingly. 14. The house of Israel has hoped for him many days.——liii. 4. He will petition on account of our sins, and our transgressions because of him will be forgiven.——They shall behold the kingdom of their Messiah." Yet this paraphrase, considered as a whole, is very inconsistent; and it sacrifices the plain sense of the prophet to the ideas of national dignity.

Witsius quotes a Jewish writer, Moses Alscheth, as saying, "For, behold our Rabbis with one consent maintain and hand down the tradition that this is spoken concerning the King, the Messiah." *Meletemata Leid.* p. 399.

[2] Supplementary Note X. [3] Supplementary Note XI.

4. "Surely, our sufferings he beareth, and our pains he supporteth. But we deemed him stricken, smitten by God, and devoted to affliction. 5. Yet he is pierced for our transgressions, crushed for our iniquities: the chastisement of our reconciliation is upon him, and by his bloody stripes we have healing. 6. All we like sheep have gone astray, each to his own way have we turned, and Jehovah causeth to fall upon him the iniquity of us all. It is exacted, and he answereth to it and openeth not his mouth [in any complaint, *i. e.* he entirely acquiesces in being held responsible]: he is led forth as a lamb to slaughter, and, as a sheep before her shearers is silent, so he openeth not his mouth. 8. From custody and from sentence he is taken away: but who of his generation attendeth to it? Since he is cut off out of the land of the living; from the transgression of my people the stroke is upon them [*i. e.* the divine judgment upon his persecutors and murderers]. A grave

is assigned him with the wicked; but his tomb is a rich man's: for he hath done no injustice, and no guile is in his mouth.

10. "But Jehovah is pleased to crush him with sufferings!

"If he will offer himself a sacrifice for sin, he shall see his posterity, he shall prolong his days, and the gracious purpose of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand. 11. The effects of his soul's pain he shall see, and shall be richly satisfied. By his knowledge my righteous servant shall make many righteous, and shall take away their iniquities.

12. "Therefore I will give him his portion with princes, and with mighty men he shall share the spoil: because he yieldeth his life to death, and is numbered with transgressors; yea, the sin of many he beareth, and intercedeth for transgressors."[1]

[1] The reasons of this attempted translation will be so far apparent to biblical scholars as to require but few explanations. lii. 13. "Be successful." The word signifies, first, *to act with wisdom and prudence;* and thence it takes the secondary sense of *obtaining success and prosperity*, as the natural and ordinary result of judicious conduct. V. 14. "Appearance,—form." Of the two words thus translated, the former denotes the general aspect, and the latter the personal figure or stature. V. 15. "Consecrate;" literally *sprinkle*, referring, as many of the best writers have remarked, to the use of water and blood in the ceremonial expiations and purifications of the law. Some deduce the verb from another origin, giving the sense of causing to rejoice; yet, I humbly think, with less evidence than belongs to the usual interpretation. liii. 2. לְפָנָיו "before him;" *i. e.* either Jehovah, or the Jewish people who are often spoken of as a singular object. With either reference, a good sense is effected; but I incline to the latter, as it appears to be more in accordance with the connexion, presenting the image of the meek and holy One rising up among his own people, in their very sight, but contemptuously neglected by them. V. 5. "Peace" restored is *reconciliation*. The expression is well known to denote that the *peace* is the EFFECT of the *chastisement*. "Bloody stripes." The proper English term would be *wheals;* but it might appear too vulgar a word for so sacred a subject. V. 8. *To think upon*, *meditate*, *attend to*, is the proper meaning of שׂוֹחֵחַ the Piel form from שִׂיחַ; and this scarcely comports with the common interpretations.* אֶת־דּוֹרוֹ in the strictest use of the language, may be a nominative absolute. Supplementary Note XII.

---

* With pleasure and gratitude, I derive the following confirmation, from a

This distinguished portion of evangelical prophecy needs no laboured elucidation. If the Scriptures are of any use to mankind, if they convey any definite sentiments, if we can at all rely on the meaning of words, if the strength and variety of phrase here employed by the wisdom of inspiration can avail to inform and impress our minds,—WE MUST believe that the Messiah would devote himself as a voluntary SACRIFICE, a real and effectual EXPIATION, suffering the heaviest woes and all the bitterness of DEATH, in concurrence with the gracious intentions of Jehovah, and for the salvation of rebellious men. In this view of the passage, which seems an inevitable result of impartial attention to it, the idea is manifestly included, that those sacrificial rites, to which perpetual allusion is made, were

---

recent work which the student of Hebrew will find of the highest benefit for acquiring a penetrating and solid acquaintance with that language. Besides its value as a practical work of grammar and structure, and a philosophical elucidation of the minutest niceties of Hebrew, the volume is rich in the illustration of Scripture-passages.

"Bishop Lowth's translation of this passage, Isa. liii. 8, 'and his manner of life who would declare?' is much forced; for דּוֹר will never signify *manner of life.* It is much better to make it, with David Kimchi, 'Who could have foretold that his generation would have such greatness?' Who, in the time when Christ Jesus was in his humiliation on earth, could have foretold that his church would enjoy blessings, of which even the prophets of old had but very faint ideas?—Or we may take דּוֹרוֹ with Aben Ezra, in this sense;—'Who could have told the men of his generation, that it would *thus* come to pass? But it is already come to pass; he is as *cut off from the land of the living.* [Mr Pauli gives the Rabbinical Hebrew of this citation, that from D. Kimchi, and that at the end of the passage here quoted.]

"Yea; who indeed could have thought, when seeing THAT JESUS going about amongst that generation, doing good, bestowing his benign deeds of mercy upon all around him,—that that generation would be base enough to become his treacherous murderers,—the murderers of Him who came to save them, the murderers of the Prince of life!

"It will perhaps not be quite unacceptable just to mention, that this most important chapter (the liii. of Isaiah, in fact commencing at ch. lii. 13), which so minutely describes the sufferings and the glory of Christ, and the redemption of his church, has always been explained by *the ancient* Jews of their expected Messiah; as Aben Ezra, in his Commentary, observes—'But many explain it *of the Messiah.*'"—ANALECTA HEBRAICA, *with Critical Notes, etc., by C. W. H. Pauli*; p. 162; Oxford. 1839.

representative of this great propitiation, and intended to be a symbolical prediction of it.

2. The authority of the New Testament furnishes additional proof of the reference which the ancient sacrifices bore to the great work of Christ.

The opinion has been mentioned before, that the sufferings of Christ are called a sacrifice in a figurative sense, and merely in accommodation to an ancient practice and long-established habits, or rather to the barbarous prejudices of a rude age. I hope that the evidence already adduced from other sources, may have appeared, to impartial consideration, sufficient to show that opinion to be destitute of any solid foundation. But I now request the candid reader to observe and judge, whether that, or the contrary sentiment which we have been endeavouring to establish, is most compatible with the plain declarations of the Christian scriptures. In the introduction of this discourse, quotations were read from the connexion of our text, which strongly asserted the emblematical intention of the ceremonial law. Declining to repeat those passages, I add to them the following.

"Behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world! Christ, our passover, was sacrificed for us. Christ loved us, and gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God.—The redemption which is by Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth a propitiatory sacrifice,[1] through faith by his blood.

---

[1] Rom. iii. 25. "A propitiatory sacrifice:" *ἱλαστήριον* of course requires the supplying of its understood substantive; and though *ἐπίθεμα* be often that substantive, here *θῦμα* is more congenial to the explanatory clause, "by his blood." V. *Hutchinson in Xenoph. Anab.* 1785, p. 12. *Hesychius*, *Alberti*, ii. 41. *Biel Thesaur. in LXX.*, and above all, *Schleusneri Lex.* But if the ellipsis of *ἐπίθεμα* be preferred, the effect will be the same; for the sprinkling of the blood upon the mercy-seat was the presentation of the sacrifice already offered. Ἐν, corresponding to the Hebrew בְּ, requires to be rendered *by*, *in*, or *with*, as the subject and connexion suggest.

Ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things,—but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot. He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the [sins of the] whole world. Who hath not daily need, as those high-priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, then for those of the people: for this he did once, when he offered up himself. Now once on the completion of the dispensations, he hath been manifested for the putting away of sin by the sacrifice of himself. It is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins. Every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but [in contrast to them] this [High-Priest], when he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God.—Thus it is written, and thus IT WAS NECESSARY that the Messiah should suffer. Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing!"[1]

Presumptuous and nugatory would it be, to attempt any addition to the strength and clearness of these divine testimonies. We only desire that they may be honestly and fairly understood, according to the established and rational rules of interpretation which we apply to the text of any ancient author.

3. The plain evidence of Scripture does not require inferior aid, and the proof of our proposition is rested here. But it deserves our observation, that the providence of God has, in this instance, illustrated his word, by a striking and memorable interposition. Within a few years after the death of Christ, the offering of

---

[1] John i. 29. 1 Cor. v. 7. Eph. v. ii. Rom. iii. 25. 1 Pet. i. 19. 1 John ii. 2. Heb. chapters vii. ix. x. throughout. Luke xxiv. 46. Rev. v. 12.

the daily sacrifice in the temple of Jerusalem utterly ceased; and has never been restored. Indeed, the destruction of the temple, and the irretrievable loss of the Levitical genealogies, have put it out of the power of man to offer a sacrifice according to the divine law. That law was provisional; "a shadow of good things to come." Its purpose has been fully answered: and by the finger of Omnipotence its expiration is recorded on the everlasting columns of historic truth.

ii. We proceed to show that all the objects which the typical sacrifices represented or declared, are REALLY EFFECTED by the SACRIFICE of CHRIST.

1. It is a demonstration of the most momentous and interesting truths, respecting the PERFECTIONS and GOVERNMENT of GOD.

He is here manifested as the MOST HOLY ONE, irreconcileable to sin, of purer eyes than to countenance evil, and in whose presence nothing that defileth shall ever stand. Had sin been pardoned and its guilt cancelled, by the exercise of sovereign will, or by an act of mere power; it might have been doubted whether the Almighty were indeed infinite in moral rectitude: it might have been surmised that sin was not so extremely odious in his sight as his word represents, nor holiness so absolutely necessary to the happiness of a rational being. But no such injurious apprehensions can be entertained by those who devoutly study the divine purity as it appears in the doctrine of Christ crucified. Sin is pardoned, but it is not palliated. On the contrary, it is branded with a deeper and more awful mark of Jehovah's abhorrence than if no interposition of grace had been vouchsafed, but the weight of vengeance had fallen on the heads that deserved it.

The JUSTICE of Heaven is displayed. This perfection of the Divine Nature is, indeed, but a necessary exercise of its essential and unchanging rectitude. "Justice is goodness directed by wisdom," says the judicious Bishop Stillingfleet. The same inspired word which tells us that God is love, tells us also that God is righteous, who taketh vengeance. And the positions are in perfect harmony. It is a necessary and honourable part of the goodness of God that he sets himself against sin. It is in the sufferings of the Saviour, as a sacrifice for the sins of those whom he hath loved, so as to give himself for them, that sin is most clearly shown to be deserving of all the detestation which the word of God expresses, and all the punishment which it denounces. The sincere Christian's abhorrence to sin is confirmed and increased, by every discovery of its intrinsic demerit: but such discoveries he makes, in the most convincing and affecting manner, in looking to Jesus, who knew no sin, yet was made sin for us; the spotless and unblemished Victim, who bore our sins in his own body on the cross. Here, too, the persevering transgressor may meditate terror; for if God spared not his own Son, when, by a constitution of wise and holy mercy, he was numbered among the trangressors, what will be the end of those, whose personal and persevering guilt equally tramples on the authority of his law, and insults the grace of his gospel? "If these things were done in the green wood, what shall be done in the dry?"

The LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY of God is brought to view in its rightful honours. His law is shown to be of the most reasonable character, and of indissoluble obligation; for it is holy, just, and good. It is the expression of his own moral perfection, and he cannot permit it to be depreciated with impunity. It is the most moderate demand that can in any reason be imagined, of excellence which deserves thus to be honoured, and of dominion which requires thus to be obeyed. A lower requirement cannot be conceived, without charging God with indifference to his perfection and dereliction of his honour. What does his law demand, but that HE should be loved and honoured *proportionably to his merit?* More he does not enjoin: less, it would be infinitely dishonourable in him to require or to accept. The righteousness of the requirement, and the correspondent equity of its sanction, are shown forth in their just glory by the obedience unto death of Jesus the Son of God. Put under the law, he hath magnified it and made it honourable, and is become the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.

The glory of eternal WISDOM is here manifested in the formation of a moral constitution, by which the guilt and punishment of sin, so far as was necessary for the purposes of sacrificial atonement, were assumed by the sinless Victim; and the worth of his obedience and his sufferings becomes imputable, on grounds of right and reason, to the sinner who is brought to a cordial acquiescence in this plan of holiness and grace. The foundation of this divine constitution is laid in a *union* of nature and covenant relationship, between the meritorious Sufferer and those for whom he suffers, so that a reciprocal proprietorship is made to exist. Striking resemblances to such a constitution of things are not wanting in the visible government of Providence:[1] and whoever has attentively considered the amount of human knowledge on the subject of cause and effect, must, I think, of necessity admit that this doctrine of a moral union between Christ and his people rests upon an unshaken foundation of philosophical truth.[2]

---

[1] See *Butler's Analogy*, particularly Part II. chap. v.

[2] Supplementary Note XIII.

Thus a way is opened for the exercise of MERCY and GRACE in a manner perfectly honourable to the attributes and government of God. He appears a just God and a Saviour; he is just, and yet he justifieth him that believeth in Jesus. And of all the condescensions of mercy, of all the gifts of divine generosity, can any be esteemed comparable with this? "God commendeth his love towards us, in that, when we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Herein is love; not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins!"

2. By the sacrifice of himself, Jesus Christ voluntarily SUSTAINED that suffering which was the marked PUNISHMENT of sin,[1] and expressly with this view, He was "made a curse for us."

We have seen that the idea of substitution, or vicarious suffering, was essential to the theory of sacrifices, as understood and practised by profane and sacred antiquity, and as we have abundant reason to believe, originally instituted by God himself. Let us now inquire whether the Scriptures do not, in clear and express terms, attribute the same idea to the sufferings and death of our blessed Redeemer.

The passages quoted under the foregoing head of this discourse,[2] are all strictly in point as evidence for our present purpose; and their testimony appears to me so full, particular, and strong, that I am unable to conceive how it can be eluded in any other way than by assuming principles which would nullify the use of language, and destroy all means of moral certainty. I need not repeat those quotations; and the addition of further testimonies might seem superfluous. But different testimonies present the same truth in other points of view, so as to serve the purpose of mutual illustration: and these varied aspects are highly useful in their adaptation to men's different mental constitutions. Let us keep in sight the precise point, for the evidence and illustration of which the following are adduced, and the preceding texts recollected: that, in virtue of the *union* constituted by the wisdom and grace of God, between the Saviour and mankind, he voluntarily *put himself in their place* and suffered as if he had been a transgressor, in order that they might be delivered from the guilt, or legal condemnation, of their sins, and, by consequence, from the pollution and practical power of sin.

---

[1] Supplementary Note XIV.

[2] P. 31-40.

"The Son of Man came to give his life a ransom for many. I am the good Shepherd: I lay down my life for the sheep: therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No one taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have commission to lay it down, and I have commission to take it again; this commandment have I received of my Father.—This is my blood, the blood of the new covenant, the blood shed on the behalf of many, for the remission of sins.[1] To feed the Church of the Lord which he hath acquired to himself by his own blood.[2] In whom we have redemption by his blood,

---

[1] Matt. xxvi. 28. This repetition seems the readiest way of expressing the twice repeated emphasis of the original, and which is evidently designed to impress the importance of the great constituent of a sacrifice, the *blood* of the victim shed.

[2] Acts xx. 28. "The Lord;" the reading established by a satisfactory preponderance of evidence. "Acquired to himself:" fairness requires that περιποιεῖσθαι should be thus rendered. It is a general word, and does not refer to the particular notion of *purchasing*, but to any method of obtaining and preserving a possession to one's self. It occurs only here and in 1 Tim. iii. 13, but many times in LXX., yet never with the idea of purchase. The same may be said of its correlate substantive, which occurs in these places: Eph. i. 14. 1 Thess. v. 9. 2 Thess. ii. 14. Heb. x. 39. 1 Pet. ii. 9.

Since the above note was written, in 1813, I have repeatedly put forth my best efforts upon the question of the reading *God*, or *Lord*, with four other variations; as that question occurred in my *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah.* The fullest discussion is in the third and fourth editions, and the result was, that the superior weight of evidence is in favour of "*the Church of the Lord.*" In the year 1842, a new labour of criticism came forth in a cheap, handsome, the forgiveness of our offences, according to the riches of his grace. Who gave himself for us, that he might ransom us from all iniquity. Who gave himself a ransom for all. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us. Who himself bare our sins, in his own body, on the cross: by whose stripes ye are healed. If one died for all, then (ἄρα, in effect) did the all die;" that is, upon the constitution of mediatorial grace, and relatively to the great ends of law. "Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God. For him that knew no sin, [God] hath made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. They fell down before the Lamb:—and they sing a new song, saying, Thou art worthy,—for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood!"[1]

Such is the current of the Scripture testimony to the nature, design, and end of the sufferings of Jesus the Messiah. These passages have been recited in their briefest form, and detached from their respective con-

---

and commodious edition of the Gr. Test. by Dr Tischendorf, Leipzig. The text is carefully established, all the Various Readings given to which any interest can attach, with the opinions of the greatest authorities upon each; and, in rich but not prolix Prolegomena, the systems of Recensions, and in particular that of Scholz (1836) are examined. It is altogether an accession to this department of Christian literature, which I may even call *indispensable* for those who would form an independent and impartial judgment. This edition, as also Lachmann's (1831), read *the Lord*. But I shall do well to cite the judgment of the late Dr Hermann Olshausen (d. Sept. 4, 1839), than whom a more pious and conscientious man it would be difficult to mention, or one better qualified by biblical and general learning. He says, "This verse has obtained great importance from its concluding clauses, in which, according to the usual reading, not only is the name *God* applied to Christ, but the error of the Monophysites (confusion of the divine and human natures), appears to be justified. But the genuineness of that reading *cannot possibly be supported* upon just critical grounds." After discussing the particulars, he concludes it as a thing fairly settled, that "Κυρίου is the right reading."—*Biblischer Commentar.* vol. ii. p. 818. Königsberg, 1834.

[1] Matt. xx. 28. John x. 15-18. Matt. xxvi. 28. Acts xx. 28. Eph. i. 7. Tit. ii. 14. 1 Tim. ii. 6. Gal. iii. 13. 2 Cor. v. 14. 1 Pet. ii. 24. iii. 18. 2 Cor. v. 21. Rev. v. 9.

nexion: but if the candid inquirer will study each of them in its proper place, and with the closest regard to the continuity of sentiment, it is my serious conviction that the impression made by this insulated representation will be confirmed and increased.[1] A writer of eminence in the polite world, who knew extremely little of theological systems, but who, emerging from a careless infidelity, read the Scriptures with attention and good sense, has described, with regard to our present subject, the effect produced on his mind by such an unbiassed study of the sacred books. "That Christ suffered and died as an atonement for the sins of mankind, is a doctrine so constantly and so strongly enforced through every part of the New Testament, that whoever will seriously peruse those writings, and deny that it is there, may, with as much reason and truth, after reading the works of Thucydides and Livy, assert, that in them no mention is made of any facts relative to the histories of Greece and Rome."[2]

Indeed I must sit down in hopeless scepticism, and abandon all reliance on evidence and reasoning, if I refuse to admit it as the doctrine taught in scripture, that the Saviour of mankind voluntarily yielded himself a sacrifice of expiation, bearing the guilt and punishment of sin not his own; when prophets, and apostles, and his own supreme authority, concur in bearing this testimony to his sufferings and the glories that should follow.

"Ought not the Christ to have suffered these things?" That is, was it not fit, proper, and necessary, in the eye of that All-perfect Being who had constructed the plan of human salvation; and who had so constructed it as to meet all the exigencies of the case, both with

[1] See Supplementary Note XV.

[2] Soame Jenyns's Internal Evidence, p. 29.

respect to the wants of the sinner, and the regards due to his own righteous government? The Saviour came to suffer. The chief part of his humiliation was his obedience unto death, even the death of the cross. Throughout his mortal course, he was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief: but especially the closing scenes of his life were the accumulation of woe. Then was the hour of his enemies, and the power of darkness. We are incompetent to form a proper conception of the precise nature and the degree of suffering, to which the dying Redeemer submitted. Excruciating were the pains inflicted on his bodily frame, which could not but be delicate and susceptible to a very high degree. But all these were light, compared with the distress of his holy soul. We may be assured, that the severity of his mental sufferings unspeakably exceeded the most affecting ideas that we can form. His agony and bloody sweat, his pungent sense of the triumphs of wickedness and the keen insults of finished malignity, the piercing of his heart by those whom he so generously loved, the bitter cries and supplications and tears which the wondrous Sufferer poured out to his Heavenly Father, —we, alas, can but very feebly and unworthily appreciate! Yet those were but the index of his internal and silent sorrows!

With respect to the degree of intensity in the sufferings of Jesus, it could not have been less than it actually was, or assuredly it would have been. When the Righteous Father was pleased to crush him with that dreadful and fatal stroke, he still ceased not to delight in the Son of his love. One shade of grief would not have passed over his soul, which infinite holiness and wisdom did not perceive to be necessary. "It BECAME him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings."

It is, I humbly conceive, worse than improper to represent the sufferings of Jesus Christ, in their last and most terrible extremity, as the same with those of condemned sinners in a state of punishment. In the case of such incorrigible and wretched criminals, there is a leading circumstance which could not, by any possibility, exist in the suffering Saviour. They "eat of the fruit of their own way, and are filled with their own devices." A most material part of their misery consists in the unrestrained power of sinful passions, for ever raging but for ever ungratified. Their minds are constantly torn with the racking consciousness of personal guilt; with mutual aggravations and insults; with the remorse of despair; with malice, fury, and blasphemy against the Holy and Blessed God himself; and with an indubitable sense of Jehovah's righteous abhorrence and rejection of them. No such passions as these, nor the slightest tincture of them, could have place in the breast of the holy Jesus. That meek and purest Lamb offered himself without spot. His heart, though broken and bleeding with agonies to us unknown, ever felt a perfect resignation to the hand that smote him, and a full acquiescence in all the bitterness of the cup which was appointed him to drink: the resignation and acquiescence of love and conviction. He suffered in such a manner as a being perfectly holy could suffer. Though, animated by the joy that was set before him, he endured the cross and despised the shame; yet there appear to have been seasons in the hour of his deepest extremity, in which he underwent the entire absence of divine joy and every kind of comfort or sensible support. What but a total eclipse of the sun of consolation, could have wrung from him that exceedingly bitter and piercing cry, "My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?"—The fire of Heaven consumed the sacrifice. The tremendous manifestations of God's displeasure against sin he endured, though in him was no sin: and he endured them in a manner of which even those unhappy spirits who shall drink the fierceness of the wrath of Almighty God, will never be able to form an adequate idea! They know not the HOLY and EXQUISITE SENSIBILITY which belonged to this immaculate Sacrifice. That clear sight of the transgressions of his people in all their heinousness and atrocity, and that acute sense of the infinite vileness of sin, its baseness, ingratitude, and evil in every respect which he possessed,—must have produced, *in him*, a feeling of extreme distress, of a kind and to a degree which no creature, whose moral sense is impaired by personal sin, can justly conceive. As such a feeling would accrue from the purity and ardour of his love to God and holiness, acting in his *perfectly peculiar* circumstances; so it would be increased by the pity and tenderness which he ever felt towards the objects of his redeeming love. A wise and good father is more deeply distressed by a crime which his beloved child has perpetrated, than by the same offence if committed by an indifferent person.

It should also be considered that our doctrine concerning the design and the effect of the sufferings of Jesus, has not produced those sufferings. They are the same, and the facts are unalterable, whatever opinion be set up concerning their reason and moral cause, under the divine government. Which hypothesis, then, is the most worthy of the wisdom and benevolence of God; the one which attributes to the sufferings of our Lord an effect beyond all description important and valuable, conferring infinite good upon innumerable myriads of beings, and spreading its beneficent influence through all eternity; or the other, which regards *the same* sufferings as nothing more than a proof of the sufferer's integrity, and an example of patient endurance, to be imitated by other sufferers if they should be so disposed?—Neither could the sufferings of Christ, if their expiatory quality be put out of the consideration, be of any service as a declaration of the general mercy of God, and his readiness to pardon sinners upon repentance: for how could the analogy or the argument be constructed? Surely it would, in all reason, bear the contrary way. If that pure and spotless One, in whom the Father was ever well pleased, was pressed down with a load so dreadful, not of outward sufferings only, but of an inward and mysterious anguish, the intenseness of which we have no means nor power of computing; what must be expected to fall upon us, who are conscious of transgressions innumerable and unspeakable against the law and majesty of Heaven?

Here let us pause, and admire, and adore. The sacrifice of Christ is not merely a great fact in history, not merely a foundation for interesting reasonings in theological science; but it touches the most intimate feelings, it affects the highest welfare of every heart. How malignant must be that evil, that enormous and detestable evil, which the unerring wisdom of God sees unfit to be pardoned without this astonishing expiation! O that we may hate it with perfect hatred, and resist it with unremitted vigour! With what lowly adoration and admiring praises should we contemplate the eternal and infinite love of God, in providing such a sacrifice! Mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace embrace each other.—Who can unfold the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge? This is the bread of life, which came down from heaven;

his flesh which he gave for the life of the world. How great, beyond expression, was the condescension of the eternal Son of God, assuming our nature, bearing our griefs and sorrows, the penal consequences of our sins, and yielding up his own invaluable life under agonies unspeakable, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, from the guilt and power of our ruinous apostasy! "Hereby perceive we his love, that he laid down his life for us.—Unto him that loveth us, and hath washed us from our sins in his own blood,—be glory and dominion, for ever and ever!"

We proceed to state a further effect of this great measure in the grace and government of God.

3. The sacrifice of Christ is a full and perfect SATISFACTION[1] to the honour and justice of the divine government in pardoning and saving sinners. In other words, it has effected a perfect RECONCILIATION and harmony between two apparently incompatible principles; on the one hand, the equity and wisdom of God's moral legislation, in all the propriety of requirement, and the veracity of denunciation; and, on the other, the exercise of his benevolence, in rescuing from ruin, and restoring to holiness and happiness those of mankind whom, out of a principle of sovereign and absolute grace (not indeed arbitrarily, but for reasons infinitely weighty, though not revealed to mortals), he may judge proper thus to bless.

That some instances of sin, though only between fellow-creatures, have a real and proper *desert* of suffering as a penalty, few can so violate the dictates of reason and moral feeling, as to deny. In the universal estimation and the ordinary language of men, acts of deep and malicious injury, of enormous cruelty, perfidy, and ingratitude, call for *condign* punishment. If we were considerate and impartial enough to extend our views to the whole moral universe, including *in a due manner* its glorious and infinite Sovereign, we should be convinced that HIS claims on the entire affection and devoted obedience of his rational creatures are infinitely superior to those of an earthly parent, friend, or benefactor, under any conceivable circumstances: that a violation of those claims has a *proportionate* criminality; and that, on the principles of equal justice, every such violation deserves an adequate punishment. On the question, *what* punishment is *adequate*, can any one be so bold as to deny that God alone is the perfect, competent, and unexceptionable Judge? And if, in his accredited revelation, he has informed us of the result of that unimpeachable judgment, is it wise, or safe, or pious, for us to entertain a different opinion? The scriptures are full of solemn declarations of God's punitive justice. He has both affirmed the claim of eternal righteousness, and declared his resolution to carry it into execution. "Wilt thou, forsooth, condemn the JUST MIGHTY ONE? According to a man's work, will he render unto him: and according to the ways of a man shall it befal him. Woe unto the wicked! Ill to him! For the retribution of his works shall be done to him. The judgment of God is righteous, and according to truth. He is righteous in taking vengeance. Vengeance is mine; I will repay; saith the Lord. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."[1] He will treat sin, and deal with sinners, *as they deserve;* but not *beyond* the measure of their desert. "Justice and judgment," not blind passion, "are the foundation of his throne." The most cursory reader of the divine word must be aware how much and how strongly it speaks of the deep, fixed, unalterable, and infinitely terrible DISPLEASURE of the great Jehovah against sin. The most vehement expressions are borrowed from the affections, actions, and language of mankind, to set before us this all-important idea. We are assured, in the most awakening terms, of the anger, the indignation, the wrath, the fury, of God against sin and sinners. Every one must admit that this is the language of condescension to the weakness of human conceptions, under the necessary circumstances of a primitive language, when men had not proceeded to the invention of more abstract and philosophical terms; and that it must be understood in a manner congruous with the perfection of the Divine Nature. No agitations or emotions, no mutability of knowledge or will, can be for a moment admitted. A careful survey of the whole testimony of the Scriptures, in this view, will show us that the design of these awfully sublime expressions is to represent to us God's necessary and infinite abhorrence of moral evil; and his determination to give all suitable evidences or expressions of that abhorrence. Those expressions must be *public*, or they would not answer the end of vindicating the divine righteousness: and they must be of such a kind, and enforced to such a degree, as shall be *adequate* to all the purposes of divine wisdom. But it is evident that, of the measure which shall constitute adequacy, God alone can judge, and fix it with the perfection of rectitude.

---

[1] Supplementary Note XVI.

---

[1] Job xxxiv. 17, partly Dr Mason Good's Transl. ver. 11. Is. iii. 11. Rom. i. 32. ii. 2. iii. 5. Heb. x. 30.

That sin, then, should be punished according to its desert, the supremacy, holiness, justice, and veracity, of the Most High absolutely require. But how can it be consistent with those perfections to punish the innocent? — Unquestionably it would be wrong to punish the innocent, as innocent, and irrespectively of any relative or compensative arrangement by which the party, though personally blameless, might suffer to the advantage of the whole case in judgment, and without ultimate injury to himself or to any. If such an instance as included these conditions could be found, the objection would in that case be disarmed. What parent would not undergo the severest labours, difficulties, and sufferings, to save a dear child from calamity or death?—And, even with regard to the affairs of the present life, the all-wise dominion of Providence not infrequently exhibits instances of individuals plunged into extreme distress and acute sufferings, in consequence of faults, in the commission of which they had no share: and still more commonly and extensively, are men, even to a remote posterity, benefited by the virtues of others, to which they have not contributed in the smallest degree. Though such cases fall infinitely short of a parallelism to the grand instance of Redemption by the Sacrifice of Christ, yet they serve to show that the notion of moral substitution has its foundation in the constitutions of nature, as fixed by their Almighty Author.

But, before any person can reasonably reject the doctrine of a moral satisfaction, by the sufferings and death of the spotless Sacrifice, in order that the immunity and happiness of the guilty may consist with the legislative honour and the judicial veracity of God; it behoves him to weigh well the *absolute peculiarity* of the case, and to consider it in *its own proper* and *singular* circumstances. Is he perfectly acquainted with *all the reasons* which determine the Being who is infinite in wisdom, equity, and benevolence, to punish sin? And be it ever remembered, that, in his most sacred word, that Being has proclaimed this determination. Is the objector aware of all the *ends* which

God proposes, in conducting this department of his holy government? Has he been admitted into the eternal counsels? Is he prepared to show that those ends and purposes may not be attained, *equally well*, or *unspeakably better*, by the method of a vicarious interposition, than by leaving the righteous vengeance to fall where it is personally due?[1] May not the holiness, wisdom, and truth of the Eternal Sovereign be preserved inviolate, his rectoral honour maintained in untarnished lustre, and his law shown to be supremely just and good;—may not sin be held up in its true colours, to the abhorrence and execration of the universe; may not every desirable effect be produced on the mind of the pardoned and restored sinner:—in fine, may not all the ends and designs of justice, wisdom, and mercy, known to mortals or unknown, be accomplished in this way, WITH INFINITE ADVANTAGE?

If still this method of grace be rejected, the condition of sinful man assumes a fearful form. Either the actual offender must undertake to meet the punitive justice of Heaven, or he must suspend his soul on the expectation that no such justice will be found to exist. Miserable alternative! Either that the denounced wrath of God is a trifle, or that his denunciations themselves are swelling words of vanity!

We have said that the case before us is one of *absolute peculiarity*. To this, let me, for a few moments, solicit your attention.

(1.) The Divine Person who undertook this great work of redemption, was perfectly *independent*, as to the accidents and relations of created existence; *free*, to purpose and to execute the design; and *able*, to go through with it triumphantly, in doing and suffering whatever was requisite, without ruin or eventual injury to himself. "Lo, I come! I delight to do thy will, O God. Therefore doth the Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No one taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have authority to lay it down, and I have authority to take it again; this commandment I have received from my Father."

---

[1] The reader will find these suggestions most admirably enforced in Maclaurin's Essay on Prejudices against the Gospel. That excellent author was the brother of the great mathematician, Colin Maclaurin, and possessed a mind of similar acuteness and vigour. A series of solid and accurate reasonings on this subject is also in President Edwards's Posthumous Remarks on Important Theological Controversies; Chap. VI. Works, vol. viii. Leeds ed.

(2.) He had a perfect *knowledge* of all that was requisite to the accomplishment of his undertaking: with infinite comprehension and accuracy, and in all the circumstances, connexions, bearings, and consequences of his awful engagement. No part of his labours and sorrows was unforeseen by him. In the approach of the dread catastrophe, how minutely did he predict it: how did he long that his baptism of sufferings might be accomplished! "He knew all things; he knew when his hour was come; he knew when all things were accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled."

(3.) His engagement was perfectly *voluntary*, and the object of his infinite complacency. "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will," any private or separate objects, "but the will of him that sent me. My meat and my drink is to do his will, and to finish his work."

(4.) In assuming our nature, he formed a *union* with the objects of his generous condescension, the guilty and ruined children of men. This union includes all the ideas of natural relation, legal guardianship, tender love, representative interest, holy conformity, and covenant establishment. This gracious constitution is represented in scripture, by comparisons adapted to convey the highest conceptions of its intimacy and importance. Christ is to his redeemed, what the husband is to the wife, the foundation to the building, the head to the animal system, and the vine to the branches. Such a union as this constitutes a ground, in the reason of things, in the feelings and common estimation of men, and in the appointment of God, for that *reciprocal proprietorship*, which is in scripture so emphatically called, his being "made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

Thus, in the case before us, no injury is done to the illustrious Sufferer by his stupendous act of benevolence and generosity to guilty man; infinite good accrues to the cause of moral right and to the general interests of the universe;—an intercommunity of relation exists between the Saviour and his redeemed, so as to form a just reason for regarding them as *one*, in a federal and legal sense;—and the reality of this union, when reduced to practical and personal application, secures the existence of genuine holiness, in the very fact of any becoming possessed of a beneficiary interest in it.

Where such conditions as these exist, though in a degree very low and imperfect, the idea of *imputation* and *substitution*, as to moral and political merit or demerit, is undeniably agreeable to the common understanding, feelings, and practice of mankind.

These considerations have been adduced with a view to prove the reasonableness of our doctrine; and to show that the chief objection which has been brought against it, is founded on crude conceptions and superficial views: as the limited notions of the vulgar, formed on first appearances, often lead them to disbelieve and deride the demonstrated truths of enlarged philosophy.

Let us not, however, suppose that all the reasons, relations, and effects of the GREAT PROPITIATION are known to us. Herein are deposited treasures of wisdom and knowledge, which angels desire to look into, and which the studies of immortality will not exhaust. If we knew, or could know, nothing besides the naked fact of atonement and redemption by the death of Christ, the TESTIMONY OF GOD affirming that fact would be, to a mind that reasoned and felt rightly, satisfactory and decisive. "For this is the testimony, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is by his Son." This divine testimony is the *proper* ground of FAITH, the holy faith which has the promise of salvation. God, who cannot lie, has assured us that Christ has been once offered to bear the sins of many, that he was legally constituted sin and a curse for us, and that in him, as the propitiation for our sins, we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of the Father's grace. "God commendeth his love to us, in that, when we were yet sinners, Christ died for us: much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." In a simple and cordial acceptance of this testimony; in an humble, and holy, and unshaken reliance upon this rock of ages; let us rejoice. It is all our salvation and all our desire.[1]

---

[1] The *necessity* of this great doctrine, upon grounds of reason, has been powerfully evinced by Mr Isaac Taylor, in his *Four Lectures on Spiritual Christianity;* particularly pp. 79-91. He demonstrates to the reason and presses upon the conscience, that "the incontestable facts of the relationship between man *individually* and the Eternal God,—a relationship at once of community, of moral nature, and of forensic dependence,—if duly considered, preclude every objection to which the scheme of Redemption might seem liable." But more citation would not be right; for the book ought to be in the possession of every man who wishes to cultivate sound habits of thought.

PART II.

ON THE PROPER VALUE OF THE REDEEMER'S SACRIFICE.

The language of the apostle attributes an incomparable excellence to the act of our divine Redeemer in offering this sacrifice for sins. "*How much more* shall the blood of Christ"—effect the specified purposes? Our subject in this view, requires attention to three points, the PERSON who presents the sacrifice, the SUBJECT of the sacrifice, and the particular CIRCUMSTANCE in which its value consists.

I. The person who presents the sacrifice is JESUS the CHRIST, the Mediator between God and man, and the High-Priest in his own spiritual temple.

The term Anointed, Messiah, or Christ, is undoubtedly a name of office, derived from the ancient mode of designating persons to any of the three important functions of priesthood, prophecy, and royalty. Under this name, and as including these functions, the Redeemer of mankind was promised. We have before seen that the predictions of the Old Testament represent him in the character of a priest, as well as a sacrifice. This office of Christ is the express topic of a considerable part of this Epistle to the Hebrew Christians. He is here largely and particularly shown to be the pre-eminent High-Priest, the King of Righteousness and Peace; prefigured by those who held a typical priesthood in the ecclesiastical polity of the Hebrews; incomparably superior to them, being in fact the only true and efficacious Priest, acting with God on man's behalf; and the exercise of whose office, in grace, power, and glory, shall continue for ever. With what gratitude and encouragement ought we to reflect, that we have SUCH a High-Priest over his own house: the Son of God, the Lord of glory, the Author and Finisher of our faith; the Minister of the heavenly sanctuary, doing in that exalted state everything that is necessary for completing the purposes of his sacrifice offered on earth, and for conveying all the blessings of salvation to all who apply for them sincerely and in his name; the Surety and Mediator of the new and better covenant, confirming its declarations, pledging himself for the fulfilment of its promises, and bestowing its blessings; by whose blood we have liberty to draw nigh to God, in all the acts of direct devotion, in the habitual reflections and communings of the soul, and in the last moments of our mortal course; who, having offered the one sacrifice to propitiate for sins, is sat down for ever on the right hand of the throne of God, the state of the highest dignity, authority, and power for all the objects of benignity and righteousness; merciful and faithful in condescending to all our wants, and adapting his blessings to our circumstances, thus sympathising with us in our infirmities and sorrows, succouring the tempted and distressed, and saving to the uttermost those who come unto God by him!

For the discharge of this momentous office, the Lord Jesus possesses a perfect fitness, on account of the union of the human and the divine natures in his mysterious person.

Being to act on the behalf of men, he is a real and proper MAN. "It behoved him to be made, in all things,—yet without sin, like unto his brethren;" a partaker of flesh and blood, as the rest of the children of Adam. "Such a High-Priest became us; holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners."

If, however, we rested here, we should only "know

Christ after the flesh:" a knowledge of little profit, compared with the vast extent of our necessities, and the high import of his character and work as the Saviour of mankind. It is a striking declaration of the eternal God, "I, even I, am Jehovah; and besides me there is no Saviour."[1] But the very intention of our Lord's priesthood is to "SAVE *to the uttermost*," to the fullest extent of time, and consequently in the highest sense, "them that come unto God by him."[2] If he performs the work which belongs to God alone, he must have the nature of God. Accordingly, at the very commencement of this epistle, the design of the apostle is unfolded, to show the value of Christianity by arguing from the dignity of its Author. Our great High-Priest is there described as not only the messenger of God, but the Brightness of his glory, and the Express Image of his manner of existence:[3] all the other messengers of God are commanded to adore him: and to him are addressed the magnificent words, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever. Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish, but THOU remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but THOU art the same, and thy years shall not fail!"

---

[1] Isa. xliii. 11.

[2] See Supplementary Note XVII.

[3] After considerable research and consideration, I have been brought to the opinion that this periphrasis is the nearest approach to expressing the exact meaning of ὑπόστασις in this passage. See *Budæi Comment. Ling. Gr.* p. 688, 689, ed. Bas. 1557. Michaelis translates it (Abdruck seines Wesens) *impression of his Essence.* Dr Leander Van Ess, who is very judicious in his selection of phraseology, has (Ebenbild s. W.) *copy* or *model of his Essence.* The same was probably the intention of Le Maistre de Sacy, whose felicitousness of expression, as well as his fidelity to the meaning, in his Version of the Scriptures, especially of the New Testament, are truly admirable. The elder Rosenmüller, who was not likely to have given such a comment if not induced by insurmountable evidence, gives this explanation: "It denotes God himself. The Son is called the absolutely perfect Image of the Father, because he is like him in power, wisdom, goodness, etc., since, by a *son*, we understand one of the same nature as the father." Schleusner paraphrases the two appellations, "The express resemblance of the Essence or Nature of God, and of his unchangeable Majesty."

It was necessary thus to mention this great truth of Christianity, so much opposed and not seldom misrepresented; though it would be improper here to digress so far as to submit even an outline of its various evidence. I would only, in passing, make one remark upon the course of proceeding which seems the most likely to lead to a rational conclusion on this important question. Since all Christians receive Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah whom the Jewish prophets predicted, it would appear a fair and unexceptionable method to collect all the characters and circumstances under which they represented the Messiah, and to compose our description of him from the whole of this antecedent evidence. We should then come the better prepared to the careful study of the New Testament, the writers of which were so thoroughly imbued with the information and sentiments of the ancient prophecies, that they evidently presuppose in their readers an acquaintance with "all that is written in Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning the Christ."

Such is the glorious Person who presented the great sacrifice, "who was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh, but is over all, God blessed for ever."

II. The SUBJECT of the sacrifice, or that in which it properly consists, is expressed by the term "HIMSELF."

The Father of mercies hath provided this Lamb for a sacrifice. "God so loved the world, that HE GAVE his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but might have everlasting life." It was in obedience to this gracious will and appointment, that the Messiah devoted himself for us. "Therefore doth my Father love me," said our compassionate Redeemer, "because I lay down my life." So unjust is the calumny often cast upon our doctrine of atonement, as if we represented the benevolence of the Son to be superior to that of the Father! From this appointment, we may infer the propriety of the sacrifice of Christ, as a measure of the divine government; and its validity for all the purposes of divine mercy.

Our text affirms that Christ offered himself WITHOUT SPOT: a sacrifice, in every sense, pure, unblemished, and perfectly holy. On this circumstance the sacred writers lay particular stress; as, without it, the sacrifice would have been altogether in vain. Had Christ been personally a sinner, in any respect or degree, he would have been utterly disqualified to achieve the work of salvation; he would have needed for himself that blessing which he came to confer upon others. The Levitical law made men high-priests that had infirmity; but he was "holy, harmless, and undefiled. He needed not to offer, first for his own sins. He was manifested to take away our sins, and in him is no sin. We are redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot."[1]

In those respects in which the sacrifice of the Messiah implied suffering, it could attach only to his human nature. The Divinity is not susceptible of pain or death. Inconsiderate language, seeming to imply the contrary to this, has done much harm to the cause of Scriptural truth. All THAT, in the Redeemer of mankind, which was capable of suffering, did suffer: all that he possessed of finite and dependent nature. But it appears reasonable to consider all that he did in his capacity and offices as a Saviour, to have a character of worth and excellency, proportioned to the COMPLETE dignity of his person. Though only the pure and perfect human nature of the Messiah could suffer, it is obvious that all the acts and sufferings of that human nature, by reason of its union with the divine, come under a *relative consideration* very different from that which similar acts and sufferings could have in any *mere* man. Analogies and illustrations from human dignities and affairs might easily be devised. But all such suppositions must, of necessity, be deeply defective. The transcendent case before us is absolutely *sui generis;* and all our reflections upon it should be conducted with the most cautious reverence, and with an anxious adherence to the light of revelation.

---

[1] Ch. vii. 26, 27. 1 John iii. 5. 1 Pet. i. 19. Also, Supplementary Note XVIII.

These observations lead to a further view of the subject.

III. The CIRCUMSTANCE which confers its proper value upon the sacrifice of Christ.

The value of this expiatory sacrifice is not to be estimated from the divine appointment alone; nor merely from the kind or intensity of sufferings which our blessed Saviour endured; but from HIS TRUE AND ESSENTIAL DEITY. This is that relative consideration, just mentioned, which confers ITS OWN dignity upon the constituted person of the Messiah, and upon his whole mediatorial work. It is the opinion of some eminent critics, and appears to me supported by probable evidence, that to this grand circumstance our text refers, in saying that Christ "THROUGH THE ETERNAL SPIRIT, offered himself."[1]

On this holy ground I advance with trembling and anxiety, lest I should darken counsel by words without knowledge. Presumption, curiosity, and the affectation of knowledge beyond what revelation permits,—I solemnly disown. Most sincerely do I reverence, and desire ever to obey, the injunction of our unrivalled poet:

---

[1] Supplementary Note XIX.

> Heaven is, for thee, too high
> To know what passes there: be lowly wise;
> Contented that thus far hath been revealed,
> Not of earth only, but of highest heaven.
> PAR. LOST, viii. 173.

My aim only is to guard the truth from the assaults of its adversaries, and to show the solidity of its base, and the symmetry of its parts. That difficulties exist, I well know. They arise in all our attempts to gain accurate knowledge. The philosophy of nature teaches us to expect mysteries in the sublimer wisdom which cometh from above. A mystery, however, is not an absurdity. It is truth seen in disunited portions: but though the intermediate parts be hid in a wise or necessary darkness, their continuity, in the perfection of divine harmony, is not the less certain. The gospel is "the wisdom of God in a mystery:" and can we be, with reason, surprised that this capital part of the gospel, which we are humbly exploring, should be, in some of its bearings, to us unsearchable or dimly seen?

In my most serious estimation, and may I presume to say, after no careless or precipitate inquiry,—"the pillar and ground of truth, and confessedly great, is the mystery of godliness;"—it is "the LIVING GOD—who was manifested in the flesh,"[1] and stamped his own glory upon the propitiation for our sins. *How* this effect was produced; *how* the Saviour's divine nature conveyed its own infinite value to the obedience and sufferings of "the flesh," the human nature;—it is no objection or difficulty with me, to believe that *mortals cannot know*. I should rather think it a presumption against any sentiment which respected the mode of the

---

[1] Supplementary Note XX.

Deity's existence and agency, that it contained nothing but what was perfectly plain to our mental perception. But we may show the reasonableness of a doctrine, and rebut the charges which rashness or profaneness may throw out against it, without overstepping the boundary prescribed to our feeble and fallen faculties. With deference, therefore, I submit to serious and candid minds some considerations, not, I trust, unauthorized by scripture and reason.

i. The assumption of human nature by the Eternal Word, who is God, was the act of an Infinite Mind, knowing, intending, and contemplating all the *results* of that act of assumption, through the period of the designed humiliation and for ever. To the Divine Mind, nearness and remoteness of time or space are equal. Consequently, as the actual assumption of human nature was the first result of the omnipotent will, so the same act, or volition, must equally have carried forwards and communicated its original divine value to all the subsequent moral and mediatorial acts of the incarnate Saviour.

ii. The union of the divine and human natures, in his person, was constant and invariable. The scriptures afford us no reason to think that the Messiah's human nature, though retaining always its essential properties, had ever a separate subsistence. To the mother of Jesus it was announced, "The Holy Being which is born of thee, shall be called the Son of God:" and according to the prophetic declaration, as soon as men could say, "Unto us a child is born," so soon was it the fact that his name was called "the Wonderful, the Counsellor, the Mighty God." It was the Mediator, *in his whole person*, that acted for the salvation of man; though it was impossible that the Divine Nature could be subject to suffering.

From these two positions I infer a third, which I venture to propose, as an unexceptionable mode of stating this important, though profound and difficult subject:—

iii. All the acts of our Lord Jesus Christ that were physical, or merely intellectual, were acts of his human nature alone, being necessary to the subsistence of a human nature: but all his moral acts, and all the moral qualities of complex acts, or, in other terms, all that he did in and for the execution of his mediatorial office and work;—were impressed with the essential dignity and moral value of his Divine Perfection.

These reasons appear to me sufficient to authorize our attributing to this holy sacrifice, a value *properly* INFINITE, on account of the Divine Nature of him who offered it. A most important conclusion! Rich in blessing to the contrite sinner: full of joy to the obedient believer.

I cannot decline, also, to observe here, how close and important is the connexion between the two leading doctrines of the Christian system, the Deity and the Atonement of Christ. They yield mutual illustration and support; and neither can be consistently held without the other.[1]

PART III.

ON THE EFFICACY OF THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

FROM the principles which have been stated, and, I trust, established by evidence, it is now easy to infer, that the Redeemer's sacrifice of HIMSELF possesses an efficacy truly divine, glorious to its All-wise and Gracious Author, and replete with boundless blessings to mankind.

---

[1] Supplementary Note XXI.

I. Every obstruction is removed to the exercise of pardoning and saving mercy, for every purpose, and in every way, that Infinite Wisdom and Goodness may see fit.

We have seen that there is evidence, from the word of inspiration and the reason of things, that sin deserves punishment, and that under the government of an All-perfect Being it must meet with its desert. The guilt of sin, therefore, so long as it remains, must separate the guilty soul from God. Nor could any repentance, prayers, works, or satisfactions of human devising, ever remove the dreadful barrier. But now this otherwise insuperable obstacle is removed, in a manner honourable to the justice and government of God, on the behalf of all who believe in Christ and obey him. To such he is the Author of eternal salvation; for he has "redeemed them from the curse of the law, being made a curse for them;" and "having made peace through the blood of his cross, he hath reconciled those that were once alienated and enemies." He hath "not died in vain;" which the word of truth expressly declares would have been the case on the supposition that "righteousness," acceptance to the favour and never-dying friendship of God, "came by the law;" as the reward of personal obedience.[1] Infinitely different from any such supposition, is the true fountain of salvation to men. Now, the streams of divine benevolence flow to unworthy mortals, in full harmony with all the honours of the divine law. Now, FREE GRACE is consistently and righteously exercised, in bestowing on the restored transgressor a full and everlasting PARDON of all his crimes. He who is of purer eyes than to behold evil, is shown to our admiring and grateful view, abundant in mercy, pardoning iniquity, transgression, and sin; a Just God and a Saviour: just and justifying him that believeth in Jesus.—Now, the active obedience of the Lord Christ is freely and graciously imputed to the pardoned sinner. He is clothed with the garments of salvation; he is covered with the robe of righteousness; he counts all things but loss, that he may win Christ and be found in HIM, not having his own righteousness, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.—Now the gift of the Holy Spirit, in all his gracious and saving influences, is freely poured out. "The Spirit is given, for Jesus is glorified;" to renew the soul in righteousness and true holiness, to train it to moral perfection, and to form and maintain that sacred UNION with the Redeemer which produces moral principles, sentiments and conduct resembling his, and which establishes the never-retracted communication of all the blessings of grace and glory.

---

[1] Gal. ii. 21.

II. A sure foundation is laid for the overtures of reconciliation, and invitations of mercy, to mankind.

Here eternal and sovereign LOVE erects its throne, and proclaims, from this mercy-seat, the act of boundless grace. "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners! Whom God hath set forth, a propitiation, through faith, by his blood; to the demonstration of his justice at the present time; so that HE is just, and yet justifying the man who is of the faith of Jesus. Now is the accepted time: now is the day of salvation. Look unto me, and be saved, all ye ends of the earth. Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely!"

Under this gracious commission, the ministers of the gospel are authorized to preach repentance and remission of sins, in the name of Jesus, to every nation under heaven. The sacrifice of the Son of God is the chief article of our message, the sun of our system, the central orb to which all the lines of christian truth converge. A convincing proof of this, is that the New Testament designates the ministry of the gospel by terms expressive only of *this* doctrine; thus intimating that, while we are sedulously to declare the whole counsel of God, our choice and capital theme must be REDEMPTION BY THE BLOOD OF CHRIST. Such terms are "the preaching of the cross, the preaching of Christ crucified, glorying in his cross, determining to make known nothing save Jesus Christ and him crucified." We, also, would tread in the steps of the inspired teachers; "preaching peace by Jesus Christ: he is Lord of all. We, then, are ambassadors for Christ; as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you, in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled unto God: for he hath made him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

A controversy has been moved, whether we are to regard the sacrifice of the Redeemer as offered generally, on the behalf of mankind, or exclusively for those who shall in the event be saved by him. This subject appears to me to involve great difficulties on both sides; and, except treated with especial caution, it is peculiarly liable to become a vain and unprofitable question. If the inquiry be understood to be, Whether Christ died for any, so as to procure the pardon of their sins and freedom from condemnation, but omitting an effectual provision for the sincere and persevering sanctity of their hearts and lives: we answer without hesitation, that, in this sense, he died for none. If the question be, Whether any child of man, who is convinced of his sins, humbled, penitent, and contrite, may entertain a doubt of the efficacy of the atonement for himself, or the gracious readiness of the Almighty Saviour to receive him to the enjoyment of all its benefits,—to this I boldly answer, that no such doubt can be entertained without a false and injurious reflection upon the veracity of the divine word. The doctrine of a sovereign, gracious, and personal election, I believe, to be clearly affirmed in the scriptures, and to be as clearly deducible by rational argument from the divine perfections. But this doctrine is totally misapprehended, if it be conceived to supersede the obligation to faith and obedience, or to limit the generous freeness with which sinners are invited to partake of the UNSEARCHABLE RICHES of Christ. There is, undoubtedly, a glorious coincidence and harmony among all the counsels and ways of God; and therefore the gracious decree of election and the designs of redemption must be in perfect unison. But whether the relation of the former to the latter, immediately regards the *original performance*, or the successive *application* of the Saviour's mediatorial work, does not, I acknowledge, appear to me to be a question very necessary or profitable, or that it is clearly solved in the divine oracles: and, where they are silent, it is our wisdom to remain so likewise. It is, also, deserving of particular attention, that the sacred writers never scruple to use large and general expressions when treating on the subject of redeeming grace; and that they employ the most unlimited phraseology, in the calls, commands, and invitations, by which they carry into effect the commission of their Wise and Benignant Lord, who is "RICH in mercy unto all that call upon him."[1]

III. This doctrine furnishes a solid assurance of preservation in holiness, and the final attainment of immortal happiness, to all who cordially accept the truth which it declares.

It is a very striking fact, which adds a weighty confirmation to all our other arguments, that the apostolic writings uniformly lay down the holiness, virtue, or morality of Christians as a system of duties and blessings, of which redemption by the blood of Christ is the antecedent *cause*, and a most forcible *obligation*. In the plainest and most uniform manner, they represent our personal obedience, not as the cause or condition of salvation, but as the primary and most essential part of salvation itself. "The love of Christ constraineth us, to live, not to ourselves, but to Him who died for us. He bore our sins in his own body, that we, being dead to sins, might live to righteousness." Thus, "redemption *from all iniquity*," is the object which the sacrifice of Christ attains. Such a redemption, personal and experimental as well as extrinsic and legal, is also the object of the most anxious desire in the breast of an awakened sinner. Emancipation from the curse would not meet his conscious wants without the concurrent blessing of vital, prevailing, and active holiness. This end the atoning sacrifice secures, not only by presenting the most probable inducements and assistances, but by an efficiency of ALMIGHTY INFLUENCE, which convinces and satisfies the understanding, persuades the heart, and determines the will. "How much more," says our text, "shall the blood of Christ —purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the Living God!" The continuance of this sanctifying agency is secured by the unchangeable value of the great sacrifice, and by the ever-living power and love of Him who offered it on earth, and is now "entered, with his own blood, into heaven itself, there to appear in the presence of God for us;" our Patron, Advocate, and Intercessor. Because he lives, his saints shall live also. Under the conduct of his Holy Spirit their holy character shall grow and flourish, till it is ripened to the perfection of heaven. He gives to them eternal life: and who shall separate them from the love of Christ?

---

[1] Supplementary Note XXII.

This encouraging sentiment is strengthened by the relation which this doctrine has to the exercise of devotional communion with Heaven. Such intercourse of the soul with God is the essential and principal instrument of maintaining the spiritual life. Yet this happy intercourse is impossible, except by a sincere dependence upon the sacrifice of Christ. By him alone, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, can we approach the Father. The blood of sprinkling is the only protection that will avail us before the Judge of all. But now "we have boldness to enter into the holiest, by the blood of Jesus;" and are assured that prayer and praise, perfumed with the fragrance of his atonement and intercession, will rise with acceptance before the spotless throne.

To that throne we must, in a short time, approach in another manner. We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ. He cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him. But none shall be able to stand in the day of his coming, except those who are "washed from their sins in his blood." To such only, will the tribunal of justice appear encircled with the rainbow of mercy; for he that sitteth upon it "is become unto them wisdom and righteousness, sanctification and redemption."

This is the principal topic on which the preaching of Christianity should dwell. Like the sun in the heavens, it is the fountain of the light and life of religion, the energy, the fervour, and the joy of the Christian character. So the apostles of Christ considered it. The doctrine of a Saviour crucified was to them the wisdom and the power of God. Its truth, its value, and its efficacy, are the same still. Innumerable instances have existed and do exist of its unrivalled effect, in the conversion of the unbelieving, the prejudiced, and the profligate, to holiness of character, to active benevolence, to the best use of life, and to a triumphant hope in death. You, my beloved brethren, students for the Christian ministry in our venerable seminary;[1] you have the strongest motives to hold this doctrine of the cross dear and precious. It is all your salvation and all your desire: and to announce its glad tidings to mankind is the choice and purpose of your lives. You participate in the pleasure afforded to me this day, of bearing a public testimony to this glorious theme. Ye are witnesses, and God also, that these are the sentiments which, privately and publicly, are professed and maintained among us, not in the elucidation of their theory only, but with a studious regard to their influence on the heart and in the life. The affectionate belief and enjoyment of this doctrine will be found, in practice, to be the only means of preserving your hearts pure and happy, your lives holy, and your ministry useful; "for other foundation can no man lay, than that which is laid; which is Jesus Christ."

---

[1] The Protestant Dissenting College at Homerton, consisting of two foundations, of which the one was established soon after the Revolution, and the other in 1730. To the Patrons and Students of that Institution, the substance of this Discourse was originally delivered on March 11, 1813.

"Upon this rock," said the Faithful Witness, "I will build my Church: and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Some carelessly disregard this grand truth, or professedly disbelieve it. But have they taken care to understand what the doctrine really is? Have they attended to it with the serious diligence which it demands? Have they scrutinized its evidence and tendency, with impartiality and prayer, with a sense of their accountableness as creatures, and of their humiliating condition as sinners? "O that they were wise! that they understood this!" O that they would faithfully search into the motives of their inattention, the secret springs of their disbelief! Are there no criminal passions, no irreligious prejudices, which indispose them to the search? Is there no pride of fancied virtue, or of imagined superiority in discernment; no unwillingness to concede the painful charge of sin and guilt and ruin, which this doctrine presupposes, and which the word of Heaven so plainly asserts; no reluctance to admit that sin is that unutterable and flagitious evil, which, on these principles, it must be; no secret dislike to those humiliating reflections, that entire self-renunciation, and those strict obligations to holiness, which MUST be felt by him who truly receives Christ as his wisdom and righteousness, sanctification and redemption? The day is coming which shall declare. Amidst the awful developments of that day, may our "faith be found unto praise and honour and glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ!"

Let us not imagine, as many do, that these are only speculations, ingenious and perhaps just; but by no means essential to the existence of religion now, or to the possession of happiness in the future state. The sacrifice of Christ, and the doctrines associated with it, are not by us conceived as matters of mere theory, so that the opinionative belief in them is all that distinguishes the genuine Christian from the outwardly virtuous and moral man of the world. The case is essentially different. It is the INFLUENCE of the doctrines of Redemption upon our own inward sensibilities and affections, in relation to God and ourselves, that constitutes the value of a scriptural faith. That faith is a holy and active principle. Were it the inert belief of any doctrine whatsoever, we would lay no stress upon it, except that which arises from the rational pleasure of knowing the truth. But we are persuaded that the state of *mind* and *motive*, upon which depends all the moral value of outward actions, is both the necessary and the exclusive product of that faith. Without it, we have no just appreciation of the moral attributes of God, no sense of the excellence of his law, no right feeling of the rectitude and beauty of obedience, or of the intrinsic deformity of sin, no repentance but that which is the constrained result of selfish fear, no vital piety, no acceptable devotion, no holy gratitude, no Christ-like benevolence, no generous and delightful charity, no solid virtue, no consistent and comprehensive morality, no "purifying of the conscience from dead works to serve the LIVING GOD."

DISCOURSE II.

ON THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.

In the preceding Discourse, many particulars concerning this most momentous office[1] and work of our Divine Redeemer, are expressly stated or less formally adverted to: but a more minute investigation, in the form of a methodical synopsis, may be useful, to place the doctrine and illustrations contained in the Epistle to the Hebrews more clearly before the reader's mind.

The articles of this enumeration will fall into two classes: the first comprising the APPELLATIVES given to our Blessed Saviour with respect to his Priesthood; and the second consisting of the DESCRIPTIVE CHARACTERS which are applied to the office itself and to his discharge of it.

I. Terms and appellations designating the *personal condition* and *character* of Christ, in relation to this office.

i. *Priest*, ἱερεύς. Our English word, like the corresponding one in the languages of several of our neighbouring nations, is a corruption of the New Testament term *Presbyter*, the meaning of which is essentially different from that which was intended by the ancient terms. The ἱερεὺς (ὁ ἱερὰ ῥέζων) of the Greeks, and the *sacerdos (à sacris faciundis)* of the Latins, plainly correspond to the definition given in the Discourse. But it is less easy to determine the primitive meaning of the name כֹּהֵן *Cohen*, since the radical verb is not found in what remains of the Hebrew language. The question is of considerable importance ; for a knowledge of the original and definite application, of either the verb or the participial appellative would bring us to an acquaintance with the ideas which were attached to the function thus expressed, by the persons who received the earliest revelations. The inquiry cannot be pursued without some aid from the Arabic dialect. Yet the employment of cognate languages, for the illustration of particular words, is a work that requires more sagacity and caution than seem to have been thought necessary by some learned illustrators of the Old Testament from Arabic forms and significations. Though the primary notion, in a given case, may be the same ; yet the accessory ideas, at an equal point of progression from the stem, will often be, in two branches or dialects, not merely different but even opposite. Kimchi regards the primary meaning of the Hebrew word to be *the rendering of honourable and dignified service*, such as that of the officers of state to their sovereign: in which he is followed by some of the highest oriental scholars, our own distinguished and hapless Castell, Giggeius, Ernesti, Simonis, J. D. Michaelis probably, Tittmann, and Eichhorn. By Cocceius the idea was laid down of *drawing near*, as to a king or any supreme authority ; and this was adopted by the elder Schultens, the father of the most solid and rational study of Hebrew literature. From this, the former meaning might be fairly deduced. Clodius *(Lexic. Vocum Hebr. Rariorum et Obscurarum)* and Michaelis *(Suppl. ad Lexica Hebr.)* mention, from the Arabic, the notion of *discovering secret things, foretelling, having occult knowledge;* and this is zealously supported by Gesenius, the rival of Eichhorn, and whose reputation as a Hebrew critic stands at the highest point. The article in his Lexicon is so important, and it is so much abridged in Mr Leo's Translation, that I shall be excused for extracting the principal parts of it.

---

[1] "The *Priestly* office of Christ is the most essential [of his relations to mankind]; it being on this account precisely that we need the Messiah. God might have been our King immediately [*i. e.* by his sovereign dominion], without appointing the Messiah to that office: he might have revealed his will to us, and overthrown idolatry by messengers merely human, as under the Old Testament: but to provide a propitiation for our sins by bearing their penal consequences, required a person of that high dignity, at once divine and human." *J. D. Michaelis Dogmatik;* Tub. 1785, p. 364.

"The verb, in its primitive form, does not occur in Hebrew. In Arabic, it denotes *to prophesy, to foretel as a soothsayer;* and, among the heathen Arabs, the substantive bore the latter signification; also that of a *mediator*, a *middle person* who interposes in any business; which seems to be the radical meaning, as prophets and priests were regarded as mediators between men and the Deity. In the Syriac dialect, the words signify the *enjoyment of riches, affluence, grandeur, splendour.*

"In Hebrew, the verb occurs only in the conjugation Pihel, in three senses. (1.) *To be*, or *become a priest.* Deut. x. 6. In the earliest families of the race of Shem, the offices of priest and prophet were undoubtedly united, so that the word originally denoted both, and at last the Hebrew idiom kept one part of the idea and the Arabic the other. (2.) *To serve as a priest, to discharge the duties of the priestly office.* Exod. xxxi. 10. xxviii. 41. xl. 13, 15. Hos. iv. 6. (3.) Following the Syriac idiom, in Is. lxi. 10, 'as the bridegroom adorneth himself with a turban.'"

In what Gesenius says upon the substantive, is nothing that needs to be cited at length. He observes, that, in some passages (as Gen. xli. 45. Ps. cx. 4), the Chaldee Targum translates the word by a term that denotes *prince* or *chieftain:* and he calls attention to the fact that the sons of David (2 Sam. viii. 18. comp. 1 Chron. xviii. 17.) and other persons (1 Kings iv. 5. 2 Kings x. 11), are styled *priests*, when they could not be properly so, but were so denominated as being *counsellors of the crown*, more particularly perhaps in ecclesiastical affairs. *Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch;* Leipz. 1823, p. 343. The correspondent article in the Latin version of this valuable Lexicon (Leipz. 1833) is to the same effect.

All these ideas might naturally proceed from that of *agent* or *mediator* between parties, as laid down by Gesenius. Aristotle describes a priest as (τῶν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς κύριος) "presiding over things relating to the gods." The apostolic definition meets every point and clearly agrees with the philological evidence: "Every high-priest taken from among men is constituted, on the behalf of men, with respect to their concerns with God, that he may present both gifts and sacrifices for sins." Heb. v. 1.

"Thou art a Priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec." v. 6. vii. 17, 21; 11, 15. "For if indeed he were on earth, he would not be a Priest, since there are," etc. viii. 4. That is, 'If I represented him as an earthly or common priest, it would not be proper to call him a priest at all; for, on the one hand, there are priests of this kind to whose class he could not legally belong; and their priesthood is only a faint shadow, a mere figure and symbol of his; and, on the other hand, his work and office refer to substantial and infinite blessings, spiritual and heavenly.' This interpretation is supported by Calvin, Michaelis, Ernesti, Heinrichs, Dindorf, Schulz, and Tholuck.

"A great Priest over the House of God." x. 21. The church or collective people of God, comprehending all its genuine members in both the present and the future life, is represented under the figure of a *temple* (as in Eph. ii. 21. 1 Tim. iii. 15. 1 Pet. ii. 5); and as the Israelitish high-priest was the chief personage in the temple at Jerusalem, so is Jesus the Messiah in this spiritual and immortal constitution, the sole, efficacious, and abiding Agent of salvation and happy intercourse between God and man.

ii. *High-Priest*, *ἀρχιερεύς*. "—a merciful and faithful High-Priest, with respect to our concerns with God, in order to make propitiation for the sins of the people." ii. 17. Tender and compassionate from his own experience of sorrows, temptations, and death (alluding to verse 14); and discharging his office with equal fidelity, in supporting the honour of God (John xvii. 4); and generosity in procuring the highest benefits for all who put their confidence in him.

"The High-Priest of our confession;" iii. 1. *i. e.* whom we acknowledge, and to whom we profess and pledge our public adherence. Brucker and Stuart support this interpretation. But ὁμολογία signifies also an *agreement, bond of union*, or *covenant;* and some very great authorities, among whom are Wesseling, Ernesti, Morus, Heinrichs, and Tittmann, adopt this idea; and explain the clause, the High-Priest, who hath fulfilled the covenant on our behalf. Yet the use of the word, in all the other places of the New Testament, where it occurs (ch. iv. 14. x 23. 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13. 2 Cor. ix. 13), is a weighty, though not necessarily decisive, reason in favour of the other interpretation.

"A great High-Priest who is passed through the heavens." iv. 14. Under the Jewish law, there were many high-priests in succession, and many who degraded the office by the feebleness and worthlessness of their characters: but the epithet "great" represents the Christian High-Priest as supreme in dignity and every excellence; singular, sole, and unrivalled; having no equal, partner, or successor in his office. Aaron and each of his successors *passed through* all the precincts and courts of the earthly sanctuary, till he arrived at his solitary and awful station; and there, accompanied by no mortal, with light such as rendered but darkly visible the ark of the covenant, the golden mercy-seat, and the cherubim of glory, he sprinkled the blood of typical expiation, presented the incense, and prayed for his nation. But the Messiah, "having offered his own blood, by which a real and not an emblematical atonement was made, entered into the true holy of holies, which is in heaven."[1] As a real and not an emblematical High-Priest, with an expiation and a righteousness not figurative but of infinite worth in the eyes of eternal holiness, he ascends on high; he passes through all the regions of beauty and greatness in the invisible world, receiving in this triumphant progress the joyous homage of "angels, principalities, and powers" (Eph. iii. 9; 1 Pet. iii. 22); he enters into that state of supreme majesty which is pre-eminently *the heavenly world;* he takes his seat of authority: he displays it to us as "the throne of grace;" he invites our devout approach; and he insures to us the greatest blessings.

"Not such a High-Priest as could not sympathize with our weaknesses." iv. 15. The figure here used (*Litotes*) is of abundant occurrence in the Greek and Latin poets, and it usually expresses *a high degree* of the quality opposed to what is denied. It is not infrequent in the poetical parts of the Old Testament: as, Ps. li. 17, "A broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise;" Is. xlix. 15, "They may forget, yet will I not forget thee." Thus this passage expresses with the strongest emphasis the tender compassion of Him who "was made flesh and fixed his tabernacle among us,—full of grace and truth." Though our blessed Lord could have no experience of any disposition to sin, or perpetration of it, any degree of its defilement, or any personal guilt; yet he had the deepest share of the woes which it has induced. He feels therefore the most prompt and generous commiseration in the sorrows of his faithful people, even though those sufferings are occasioned, indirectly or directly, by their sinful infirmities, which yet they sincerely lament and resist; and his sympathy is not barren pity, but it is always active to the administration of "mercy and grace for help in the time of need."

---

[1] The words of *Dr Priestley*, on Heb. ix. 12, in his posthumous *Notes on Scripture.*

"Christ did not assume to himself the honour of becoming High-Priest." v. 5. The Lord Jesus always ascribed his mission, his particular acts and proceedings, his doctrine, and his entire authority as the Messiah, to the express will and appointment of his Divine Father: *e. g.* John v. 19, 26, 27, 43. vi. 38. vii. 28. viii. 54. x. 18. But that mission is here declared to involve the acts and function of the supreme priesthood.

"Addressed by God, High-Priest, according to the order of Melchisedec," v. 10, referring back to v. 6, from Ps. cx. in which the Divine Father addresses the Son, "Thou art a priest for ever."—I subjoin Michaelis's Paraphrase of the whole passage, v. 7–10. "This office he has actually fulfilled in the manner already described. He has himself experienced our distress and dread at the approach of death; that hereafter, at the aspect of it, a peculiar sympathy might arise in him. For in the days in which he walked on earth, encompassed with a weak and dying body, he made supplication, in lowly prayer, with vehement crying and tears, to God who could deliver him from death. God heard his prayer and freed him from the distress at which he had trembled, or (to make use of an expression of a Psalm which treats of him), he 'heard him from his fear' [Ps. xxii. 22]. It might appear that, as the Son of God, as the Messiah, he might have required exemption from the labours and sorrows of human life; but he condescended to them, that he might learn through suffering a new kind of obedience, the practice of which peculiarly belongs to us sinners. When he had endured this painful consecration to the priesthood, and had offered his first but only sacrifice, he became, to all those who on their part are obedient to him, the cause of everlasting salvation, and obtained from God the name of a Priest of the order of Melchisedec." *Erklärung des Briefes a. d. Hebr.* p. 175.

I would suggest to the reflection of my reader, that the idea upon which this somewhat eccentric and at times seemingly irreverent writer, but who is often profoundly and happily sagacious, lays great stress, *the manner in which Christ could learn obedience*, is of great importance. The eternal Son of God is, notwithstanding his divine nature, subordinate in the order of Deity, and ever perfectly obedient to the Father. To have been thus *subject to the Father*, from all eternity and by the necessity of the divine personality, is no more incongruous with the proper and essential divinity of the Son, than it will be, after the consummation of the present system of things, when the great parenthesis of the mediatorial administration shall be completed, and "God shall be all in all." Also, as Messiah, in an assumed nature, and as the servant and messenger of God, he owed all the obedience that was compatible to the state of a perfectly holy person. But that specific kind of obedience which consists in resigning one's self to suffering, *expressly as the punishment of sin*, is no part of the original and necessary obligation lying upon any sinless being; it belongs, naturally and properly, to none but sinners. That Christ, "who knew no sin, but was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners," did in fact submit to *this kind* of obedience, is an invincible proof that he stood in a new relation, not properly his own, but assumed; that, in plain terms, he bore *our* sins, he was wounded for *our* transgressions, he was made a sin-offering *for us*, he was made a curse *for us*. In this astonishing way it was that he was *made perfect* (τελειωθεὶς, *borne onwards to the end, completed*, every thing having been done that the case required), in his capacity of being a Saviour. The apostle has expressed the same idea before; "the Author of salvation was to be made perfect through sufferings:" ii. 10, and, with the further respect to the glorified state of Christ, he is declared to be (τετελειωμένος) *made perfect for ever*, a complete Saviour, besides whom, and after whom, there can be no other. vii. 28. His grace and his power, his expiation and intercession, are adequate to meet all our necessities of sin and sorrow. Why should we not imitate the excellent Bengel, who so often, in his *Gnomon*, and in his German Notes on the N. T. rises from a grammatical observation in a devout rapture of ejaculation?—Gracious Saviour, let thy mercy flow to me!

"Made a High-Priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec." vi. 20. Explained in the preceding Discourse, page 33, in its original occurrence in Ps. cx. The position which this sentence and the enlargement flowing from it, hold in the Epistle, yields a clear proof of the vital importance of the doctrine in both the system of Christianity and its practical influence.

"Such a High-Priest was necessary for us, holy, guiltless, spotless, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens," vii. 26. Πρέπει, in the New Testament style, denotes a *moral necessity*, between which, indeed, and *propriety* there is no difference but in degree. See ii. 10. Matt. iii. 15. Eph. v. 3. 1 Tim. ii. 10. Tit. ii. 1. In the Hebrew style, and in perfect agreement with the propriety of things, "the heavens" denoted the noblest parts of *creation*, to the widest extent, mechanical, intellectual, and moral; all that is more glorious than the earth and its inhabitants; in a word, every thing that is above us, but inferior to the Supreme Being. The last article, therefore, of the description presents to us the Lord Jesus, besides his perfect moral excellence, as possessing, in his capacity of High-Priest, for the purpose of effectuating salvation, an official station higher than the highest of the works of God. Compare i. 4. Eph. i. 21. 1 Pet. iii. 22.

"The great point, in relation to the things which we have been treating, is this, that we have such a High-Priest, who is seated at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens." viii. i. Κεφάλαιον may signify a *summary* or brief recapitulation, as it was taken by both Luther and Calvin, and is followed in our common version and some others. But its more proper meaning is *the chief part* of a subject, what Suidas, in reference to this very passage, calls τὸ μέγιστον, *the greatest thing*. It is so interpreted here by Bullinger, De Sacy, Brucker, Heinrichs, Michaelis, Dindorf, Leander Van Ess, Stuart, De Wette, and Tholuck: and with evident propriety, for the subsequent part of the discussion, which reaches to the end of chapter x., is by no means a summary of what had gone before; it enters upon much new matter, and expands into various applications not before touched upon. Hence, the single sentence thus introduced is an aphorism, presenting the great topic in a clear and detached form. The "throne of the Majesty in the heavens" is evidently intended to designate the *state* (from which the Scriptures do not warrant our excluding a refined and exalted idea of *locality)* in which the Being and Perfections of God (which in their essence admit not of any local limitation), are *manifested* in the most complete manner that created minds are capable of receiving. See i. 3. The phrase, *to sit at the right hand*, is most probably used in reference to Ps. cx. 1. "It is derived," says Michaelis, "from the seat of God in the most holy place over the ark of the covenant, in relation to which [symbol] only can a right and left hand be ascribed to HIM who filleth all things. No mortal dared to venture upon entering the most holy place, except the high-priest alone, who, once in every year, not without apprehension of death (for death would be the consequence of the slightest oversight in performing the ceremonies), and with the blood of expiation, entered into this terrible and sacred darkness. To sit down at all in the most holy place would have been a rashness and insult unheard of: but for a person to place his seat close to the cherubim, at the right hand of the invisible God who dwelt above them, would have been strictly equivalent to *declaring himself God, and requiring to be adored as God:* for every prayer of the Israelites was addressed, without any other visible object, to the most holy place, and indeed to the Deity who held [symbolically] his invisible throne at the western end of the sanctuary. When therefore Jehovah says to 'the Lord,' the King and Priest of the race of David, 'Sit thou at my right hand;' it is, in the highest sense, equivalent to saying, 'Enjoy with me divine honour and adoration: be the object of all the religious service of my people.' But still further, from the next clause, 'until I make thine enemies thy footstool' (*i. e.* till the time when thou shalt again come forth out of the most holy place, and wilt have beneath thy feet, instead of the ark of the covenant, the field of battle covered with thy prostrate enemies), it appears to be intimated that, in like manner as the most holy place was inaccessible to men, and concealed entirely from their eyes, so the Messiah should be withdrawn from the sight of his enemies. This final circumstance has been accomplished by the ascension of Christ into the heavenly state, by which he entered into the true most holy place, the peculiar presence of God, where no mortal eye can pierce to view him, where no enemy can reach to injure him." *Anmerk. zu Ps.* cx. 1. I own that this interpretation appears to me by no means fanciful or unreasonable; and, being derived from the sacred rites of the Hebrew nation, it is more probable, on the ground of nearer affinity, than the interpretation which rests on the custom of oriental sovereigns to place for a foreign monarch, on a visit of state, another throne on the right of that filled by the indigenous monarch. This however gives the same general sense, that of the highest dignity; but it does not comprise the accompaniments presented by Michaelis's explication, which have a peculiar importance in themselves, and the closest relation to the subject before us.

"Christ becoming present [with us], a High-Priest of future blessings," ix. 11. The Levitical priesthood and its services (described in v. 1–10) respected only temporal advantages, remissions, and purifications, with regard to factitious disabilities, bodily, ceremonial, and political; they had no intrinsic value, and were not efficient of moral benefits extending to man's eternal state, except so far as their symbolical design was apprehended and faithfully applied. But, in contrast with these, the Messiah, by the sacrifice and offering of himself, procures and bestows blessings which are not symbolical and subsidiary, but *real*, not stopping short in outward observances, but directly occupying and exercising the *internal faculties* of the mind, consisting not in civil qualifications and immunities, but in the actual *pardon* of sin, the gracious *favour* of the Infinite Judge, and a *conformity* of the moral feelings and active principles to his approving will ; in a word, referring not to this earthly state as their scene of chief enjoyment, but to our *future and everlasting* existence. A contrast is here effected between the ideal representation of Moses, whose life and actions lay far back in the Israelitish history, and whose institutions were spiritually valuable only as emblems for instruction ; and the powers and prerogatives of Christ, his continued presence with his Church, and the substantial nature of the blessings by him conferred.

iii. " The *Apostle*," ἀπόστολος, better translated *Messenger*, iii. 1 ; thus presenting a circumstance of parallelism with Moses, who was often declared to be *sent* by God ; and the high-priest, who (as Dr Tholuck, *in locum*, informs us, from the *Mishna*, *Joma*, Day of Expiation, Surenhusius's edition, Part ii. p. 209) was solemnly proclaimed by the Sanhedrim to be their *messenger*. It was essential to the character of the Messiah, that he should be expressly commissioned and *sent* by God, as Moses was (Exod. iii. 14), and all the true prophets : Jer. v. 25. This qualification Jesus frequently, and in the strongest manner, asserts to himself : *e. g.* John iii. 34. vii. 42. xvii. 8, 18, 21, etc. In a distinguished prophecy concerning him, under this description, and where he is called " The Messenger of the covenant" (*i. e.* sent in pursuance of a covenant or gracious promise of God), a special intention of his office is laid down to be "purifying the sons of Levi." Mal. iii. 1–3. The image being that of refining metals in the furnace, and the intention being declared to be kind and gracious, we cannot apply this feature of the prediction to the destroying judgments which fell upon the Jewish nation and its extremely corrupted priesthood, by the Roman invasion. The rational interpretation appears to be, that the Messiah would purify or retrieve from abuse the Levitical institution, by fulfilling its *great moral design;* and of this the sacrificial rite was the chief part: thus corresponding to the sense of this passage in the Epistle, and connecting the *mission* of Christ with his *high-priesthood.*

iv. "*Minister of the sanctuary,*" Λειτουργὸς τῶν ἁγίων. Public officer of the holy place, or of the holy things. viii. 2. The proper Latin sense of *minister*, an attendant or servant, is quite inapplicable. Ernesti, whose exquisite taste in Latinity has been universally celebrated, proposes to render the phrase *Antistes sacrorum.* Michaelis, conceiving that the proper German word for minister would have a diminishing effect, and that the meaning of the apostle is the same as if he had used the term *Priest*, has taken that word both in his Paraphrase (*Erklärung* 1762), and in his Translation and Notes in 1791, the year of his death. The design of the description plainly is to lead our minds to conceive of the Lord Jesus as *presiding over* the universal worship of the Church, both on earth and in the glorified state; directing it by his authority, rendering it acceptable by his merit, and presenting it by his intercession. That worship is a "*reasonable* service" (Rom. xii. 1, ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία), lying in affections and acts of the mind, a worship in spirit and in truth, not a system of gesticulations, dresses, local attributions, or any kind of ceremonies. The only Christian symbolical actions, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, do not act as charms, as having any inherent virtue in themselves; but their value lies in the practical application of their significancy.

v. "*The Lord*," by whom "the great salvation was spoken to us," and who now "delivers the divine oracles to us (*χρηματίζων*) from Heaven," ii. 3. xii. 25. With respect to the latter verse, it is observable that the person "who spake on earth" is the same who "now speaks from heaven;" for it is immediately added, "whose voice then shook the earth," the relative not admitting of any other antecedent. "The opposition expressed is not between the persons speaking, but between earth and heaven." *Owen.* "Hence it appears that the law was given by the Son of God." *Ernesti.* "It is very clear that the giving of the law is here ascribed to Christ.—This manifestly belongs to his Divine Nature; and I cannot comprehend how any person whatsoever, who believes the Gospel of John, can find any difficulty in assigning to the Divine Nature of Christ a participation in the giving of the law." *Michaelis Erklär.* Our blessed Lord is further represented as "*now* speaking from heaven" to Christians generally; of course (if even we were, contrary to all just reason, to confine the reference to the persons to whom the Epistle was immediately written, and their contemporaries), to multitudes who never saw or heard him in the days of his flesh. This could be only by the agency of inspired men, whose commission to teach, and command "in the name of Christ" was proved by miracles; and those miracles *they attributed* to Him, as is plain from many passages in the Acts and the Epistles. Thus Christ stands in the very position of power, authority, and action, continually ascribed to Jehovah in the Old Testament, *speaking by his prophets.* This, observes Michaelis, is "saying of Christ the greatest thing that can be said."—*Anmerk.*

vi. *He who makes men fit to be presented to God,* ὁ ἁγιάζων. "He who sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one [father]; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren." ii. 11. The term *sanctifying* here evidently requires to be taken in a large sense, as it corresponds to the bringing many sons to glory through the death and sufferings of the Prince of salvation, just before stated. Michaelis has a very just and valuable remark, in both his early and his dying Commentaries upon this book: namely, that the sense of ἁγιάζειν, in this Epistle, usually is that which the corresponding Hebrew words bear in the Levitical laws, namely, to restore to a capacity of drawing near to God, in the instituted acts of worship, persons who had been excluded on account of any disqualification. Accordingly, in his *Erklärung*, he paraphrases the verse thus: "For he who acquires for them the liberty of access to God, and they for whom it is acquired, cannot but have one and the same way to glory: since they are children of one common Father, even Abraham: therefore, he is not ashamed to call them brothers." And, in his version, he expresses it; "For the Expiator and the expiated all descend from one ancestor."

vii. From the same passage, we draw another interesting view of the relation of Christ to the objects of his redeeming mercy: he is their *brother*, of one race with them, a partaker of flesh and blood in like manner with the children of men. This participation is spoken of as an act of *condescension;* and its design is expressed to be *deliverance* from the greatest evils. The former is not my present subject: but let it be allowed me in passing, to ask whether, on the supposition that the

Messiah was merely a human being, it could ever have been said of him that he "was not ashamed" to acknowledge his fellow-men to be his *brethren.* Could higher folly and arrogance be imagined, than that a man should speak, or feel, or act, so as to justify such an expression? Yet it is a part of the apostle's encomium upon his Lord and Master! Admit that he had a nature superior and really divine, and there is the strictest propriety in the expression: but on any lower hypothesis, even that of the highest Arianism, I do not see how it could be reconciled with wisdom, modesty, and truth. It appears self-evident that, not only the most virtuous man, but even the loftiest of any superior created intelligences, would esteem it an honour to be called a brother of mankind; considering the capacities of human nature, and the high degrees of intellectual and moral excellence to which many of the human race have arisen. The other observation refers to the *design* of this participation of human nature. This design is expressed, in the connected parts of the statement (v. 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17), to be the *suffering of death*, as an effect of singular grace, for every man; *deliverance* from the bondage and dread of death, and something which lies in the darkness beneath death, and is more terrible than mere mortality; *propitiation* for sins; the *bestowment* of salvation; the conducting to the *glory* of immortal purity and blessedness; the securing, by this wondrous intervention, of "the things pertaining to God," in their amplitude of reference to all the designs of his wisdom and goodness, and to the eternal interests of mankind.

This argument will remain the same, whether we supply the ellipsis after *one* by Adam, or Abraham, or GOD (a noble and impressive sense, and supported by our Lord's words of richest grace in Matt. xxv. 40, "one of the least of these my brethren");— or, as Calvin, with his usual penetration and judgment, does, by some term equivalent to γένους, race. He says, "I am inclined to suppose that the identity of *nature* is intended, understanding ἑνὸς in the neuter gender; as if the writer had said that we are made of one mass. The passage thus contributes in no small degree to the confirmation and increase of our faith, we being joined by so close a bond of relationship to the Son of God, that we may obtain in our own nature that holiness which we so need." *Comm. in locum.*

viii. "*Surety* (ἔγγυος) of a better covenant." vii. 22. The gospel-covenant is here stated to be superior to the Levitical, in proportion as the dignity of a divine oath confirmed its perpetuity, and consequently proved the higher description of its blessings. The appellation presents Christ to us as pledging himself for the fulfilment of the stipulations, on both sides; for God the righteous Judge, to man the supplicant for mercy; and for man the repenting and believing sinner, to God the Giver of divine good. This leads to the ideas which have been submitted upon the signification of the word *Priest*, as denoting one who transacts, intermediately, the infinite concerns of men in relation to their Almighty Ruler: and it corresponds also with the term next to be illustrated.

ix. "*Mediator* (μεσίτης) of a better covenant." viii. 6. The preceding clause in this sentence, "he hath obtained a more excellent λειτουργία," confirms the identity of purport between this appellation and λειτουργὸς, *Minister*: and it is manifestly of the same sense and design as *Surety*. The superiority of the gospel-dispensation is here alleged with respect to the nature and objects of its *promises*. Those of the Mosaic economy respected length of life, a numerous and prosperous population, a fertile land, favourable seasons, successful industry, superiority to enemies, and other temporal advantages: as this subject is well illustrated by the late Dr Erskine in his *Dissertation on the Sinai Covenant*, in which he separates the most valuable principles of Bishop Warburton's *Divine Legation of Moses*, from the mass of extraneous and objectionable matter. But the blessings of which the Messiah is the immediate Procurer and Bestower, refer to the holiness of the soul, and to its immortal interests. The primary meaning, then, of μεσίτης and ἔγγυος might be expressed, as Ernesti and others have remarked, by the Roman law terms, *Interpres*, *Internuncius*, *Sequester*, *Fidejussor*. See his *Clavis Ciceroniana* and his *Lectiones Academicæ in Ep. ad Hebr.* p. 692; and *Tittmanni Opuscula Theologica*, p. 225. Thus Virgil, "Ille hominum divumque interpres." *Æn.* x. 175. We also find in Tertullian, "Caro [*sc.* fidelium] in deposito est ubicunque apud Deum, per fidelissimum sequestrem Dei et hominum Jesum Christum, qui et homini Deum et hominem Deo reddet." *De Resurrec.* cap. lxiii. ("The bodies of believers are, in every place and condition, deposited with God, by that most faithful Mediator [sequester] between God and men, Jesus Christ, who will restore God to man, and man to God.") Yet, of those terms the last is the most proper and precise. In the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, a *Fidejussor*, sometimes called by a more general term *Adpromissor*, is one who, by virtue of a stipulation, and without any secret understanding for his own indemnification, takes upon himself the obligation of another.

Μεσίτης is used by the Septuagint translator of the book of Job (whose skill and judgment were far superior to those of most of the other authors of that version) evidently to *complete* his expression of the sense of the participle מוֹכִיחַ, in ch ix. 33. "There is between us no *arguer* [who might fully represent the cause, and state, judge, and arbitrate fairly for each party], who can lay his hand upon us both." A striking declaration, illustrating the most ancient ideas of the capacity required and the agency of a mediator, and not less the conviction of *necessity* for such an interposer in the great moral and judicial concern between man and his Creator.

An important passage in the predictions of Jeremiah exhibits the character and work of a Mediator: and this passage is the more necessary to be brought into light, as our generally excellent and judicious translators have totally eclipsed it, by following the confused Septuagint[1] in rendering the principal term as if it were plural, contrary to both the grammar and the connexion of the sentence. The connexion depicts the holiness and blessedness of the gospel-dispensation, according to the usual manner of the prophets, by a series of transitions from the circumstances of the return from Babylon, and the prosperity of the Jews under their native princes. Hence some have supposed the passage to be a prophetic description of the patriotric and zealous Maccabæan, or more properly called Asmonæan, family, and in particular of John Hyrcanus, the first independent prince of Judea, and of whom Josephus says that he was "honoured by God with the three greatest dignities, political dominion, the high-priesthood, and the gift of prophecy."[2] If this application be regarded as the mind of the Holy Spirit, the description will still fully avail for assisting our conceptions of a Mediator, in the general idea. But the connexion carried on to chap. xxxi. 1, and especially the peculiar sanctity of the character depicted, appear to be reasons of weight sufficient to determine the application to the Messiah. Hyrcanus was a great and probably a good man: but he was a military conqueror, he reigned by force of arms over vanquished and tributary nations, his kingdom was one of this world: the prophetic character he did not assume, and the grounds on which Josephus ascribes it to him are very insufficient. At least, the ultimate and perfect fulfilment of the prophecy far better suits the spiritual mediation and character of the Divine Redeemer, than those of any earthly deliverer. The passage is this; "And their PRINCE shall be from themselves [*i. e.* independent on any earthly auxiliaries], and their RULER shall proceed from the midst of themselves: and I will bring him near, and he shall approach unto me: for Who is this that hath pledged his heart to approach unto me, saith Jehovah: and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God." Jer. xxx. 21, 22.[1] The grounds of application to the Messiah are thus briefly stated by Dr Seiler: "The greatest of all the princes that have sprung out of Israel, and to whom especially this passage has respect, is our adorable King and Lord Jesus Christ. He it is, who with entire heart has drawn near to God. He, as the eternal High-Priest hath entered into the most holy place, the presence of God, to make reconciliation for both Gentiles and Jews. He hath perfectly assured us of the favour of the Most High. Through faith in him, we become children of God; and the great promise is fulfilled to us, 'Ye shall be my people, and I will be your God.'"[1]

---

[1] The prophets, in general, excepting Ezekiel and Amos, have been translated by the persons who made this ancient Greek version, with extraordinary carelessness and apparent ignorance of Hebrew; and, in addition to these original defects, the lamentable altering of the LXX. by Origen or his followers, under the notion of amending it, have probably made the obscurity deeper.

[2] Τριῶν τῶν μεγίστων ἄξιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ κριθεὶς, ἀρχῆς τοῦ ἔθνους, καὶ τῆς ἀρχιερατικῆς τιμῆς, καὶ προφητείας.—*Josephi Antiq. Jud.* XIII. x. 7.

---

[1] The new translation of Jeremiah by Dr Dahler, Professor of Exegetical Theology in the Protestant Seminary at Strasburg, gives the passage thus:

> "Leur chef sera pris de leur sein,
> Et leur prince sortira de leurs rangs.
> Je le ferai approcher, et il viendra vers moi.
> Car qui est-ce qui oserait s'approcher de moi,
> [Sans que je l'aie appelé]? dit l'Eternel."
> *Jérémie; traduit sur le Texte Original*, etc. Strasb. 1825.

The authority of De Wette is particularly to be observed, on account of his unhappy prejudices. His version may be thus closely expressed in our language: "And their Leader [Anführer] shall be out of themselves, and their Ruler shall come forth out of the midst of them; and to them [*or* to him, *the Ruler*, De Wette adds] I will give access, that he may draw near to me; for who maketh bold [*literally*, pledgeth his heart, *i. e. his life*, De W.] to draw near to me, saith Jehovah?"

Here, then, we find a true and efficient Mediator depicted as possessing a previous and independent right, as one in union of nature with those whom he is seeking to bless, as pledging himself to the fulfilment of his work, as approaching the awful presence of the Deity, the Holy Judge of men, on their behalf, as approved and accepted by God, and as returning to mortals with the most gracious and all-comprehending promise of the new covenant.

It might seem an unbecoming omission not to notice another important passage, which evidently claims a principal consideration in any attempt to ascertain the scripture doctrine of a Mediator: Gal. iii. 20. "Now a Mediator is not of one: but God is one." In attempting to elucidate a passage which is, by some eminent critics, called the most difficult in the Bible, I may hope for candid indulgence.

It appears plain that the intention of the paragraph, v. 17–24, is to show that the Mosaic law was not inconsistent with the gospel of Christ, but, on the contrary, was in harmony with the principles of the gospel, and entirely subservient to its design. I conceive that the article does not refer to the object of μεσίτης in the sentence immediately preceding, but is employed for anticipative reference (see Cardinal Bessarion, in *Budæi Comment. Ling. Gr.* col. 1552 and 1554, ed. Basil. 1557, and *Bishop Middleton on the Greek Article* p. 57), so as to denote any one who acts as a mediator. It also appears reasonable to allow—that ἑνὸς and εἷς must, unless we violate the common rules of language, be taken in the same signification, though their application be different;—that the genitive should be understood with its own natural force to denote *property* or *possession*;—and that the most fair and unforced supplement is some word signifying *party*, which Sir Norton Knatchbull says is actually supplied in the Æthiopic version. If those points be admitted, the whole passage may be interpreted thus:

---

[1] *Grösseres Biblische Erbauungsbuch*, vol. vii. p. 408. Erlangen, 1792. See also, an excellent elucidation of this text in the posthumous *Pastoral Memorials* of the late admirable divine, Dr Ryland, entitled *The Reasonableness of Christ's Mediation*. I select a paragraph, Supplementary Note XXIII.

(V. 19.) In the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, an intervening agent between God and the people was employed, namely Moses. (20.) But such an intervening agent does not belong to any single party. Had the revelation made on Sinai been a promulgation of simple law, there could have been no such interposer; for in the declaration of authoritative commands, the superior person acts a part purely sovereign. He issues his mandate, and he expects unqualified obedience. Had, therefore, the declaration from Sinai been such, God would have given it immediately from himself. But, on that occasion, he was pleased to act as ONE of two parties treating with each other. (See Deut. v. 5, 23, 27, 28.) So that the employment of Moses in this service of intervention between Jehovah and the Hebrew nation, was a kind of condescension to the distress and the fears of the people, was an act of special grace, and was an intimation of still greater mercy to be shown to sinners. (21–24.) Therefore the Law of Sinai is not contradictory to the design of the Gospel; for, though it could not give pardon and spiritual blessedness, it was admirably adapted to serve as a preparatory arrangement for the introduction and illustration of that glorious and effective grace which shines in the gospel of Christ.[1]

Among the almost incredible multitude of explications which have been proposed, of this passage, a very remarkable one was published at Erfurt, in 1821, in a Dissertation of 161 pages, intitled, 'Ἑνὸς, *in nobilissimo Pauli ad Gal.* iii. 20 *effato, haud Genitivo sed Nominativo Casu esse positum, examinatis aliorum* ccxliii. *Interpretum Explicationibus; etc. Auctore G.*

---

[1] I have been favoured with some observations upon this passage, which are too valuable to be suppressed. They lay an ampler basis for the superstructure than I have done, but they seem to me to strengthen and confirm the interpretation proposed above. The kind communicator is a divine, to whom sacred learning and pure religion are under public obligations, the Rev. Samuel Davidson, LL.D., Professor of Biblical Literature in the Royal Academical Institution, Belfast; and author of a work of great comprehension and extensive usefulness, "Lectures on Biblical Criticism." 8vo, 1839.

"I take the article before μεσίτης to denote *any one* who acts as mediator, and not to point to Moses, the mediator just mentioned. Ἑνὸς and εἷς must, I think, be taken in the same signification, unless the common rules of language be violated. The genitive denotes, as usual, *property* or *possession;* and the most natural ellipsis is certainly some word signifying *party.* It appears, indeed, that a term of this kind is actually supplied in the Ethiopic version. The whole verse is parenthetical, and was apparently suggested by the mention of μεσίτης in the preceding sentence. Admitting these preliminary points, the whole may be thus interpreted:—'A mediator is not of one party, but God is one of the parties.' In the preceding verses, the apostle had been endeavouring to show, that the law did not annul the promises made to Abraham; and that it did not bestow salvation upon its adherents. In answer to a supposed objection (why then did God give it?), he states its use, viz. to check sin and convince of sin. 'It was added,' says the inspired apostle, 'because of transgressions, being arranged by angels in the hand of a mediator.' At its promulgation, an agent intervening between God and the people was employed, *i.e.* Moses. Such an agent does not belong to one party. Wherever there is an *internuncius*, there must be two parties; and *in the case of the law*, God was pleased to act as one of them. Compare Deut. v. 4, 5, 23, 27, 28. Since then at the giving of the law God was one of the

H. F. Weigand. My knowledge of this Dissertation is derived from an article in the *Révue Encyclopédique* for September, 1825, and which I believe may be attributed to the late estimable Mr Göpp, one of the Pastors of the Lutheran Church at Paris. It appears that, supported by a mass of Greek learning, Mr Weigand considers ἑνὸς as a rare substantive, used to signify the Jewish high-priest when performing the annual service of the great expiation. So far as, from the brief article, I can divine his interpretation, it seems to be to this effect; "He who can act as a real and efficient mediator between sinners and God, is not the Levitical high-priest, even when exercising his highest function of a typical expiation: it is God, in the person of the Messiah, who alone can so act."

The passage, Heb. ix. 15–17, lies under a difficulty

---

parties, it could not be contradictory to the Abrahamic covenant. Both originated with Jehovah himself. He it was who gave the promise to Abraham and ratified a covenant with him. He also delivered the law from Sinai; and was pleased in great condescension to the fears of the people to employ the intervention of Moses; thus making himself one party in the transaction, while the Hebrew people was the other.

"In the eighteenth verse, the apostle had said that the inheritance came by the *promise*, not by *the law*. In the next verse, he declared the purpose which the law served; and in this short sentence, he shows that, whilst the law served such a purpose, it was not contradictory to the Abrahamic covenant; since God himself was one of the parties at the giving of the law, just as he was in the transaction with Abraham. The law therefore could not do away the promise, because the unchangeable Jehovah could not but be consistent with himself. His promise must stand firm and sure, notwithstanding the subsequent promulgation of the law; especially since he was the principal actor in both cases. He was one party in the διαθήκη with Abraham—he was also one party in the Mount Sinai διαθήκη, four hundred and thirty years after—how then could he contradict himself? The supposition is impossible; and therefore the latter could not make the former void.

"Such is a very condensed statement of the meaning and connexion of the passage, as far as I have been able to perceive them. I do not know of any writer who has exactly hit upon the same view; indeed I have not read the expositions of many. I propose it with much diffidence, where so many distinguished divines have found an inextricable labyrinth. The three hundred expositions of it on the continent, many of them proceeding from the ablest scholars of Germany, are quite sufficient to check the first risings of certainty in the mind. If we were more prayerful, we should oftener understand the mind of the Spirit."

which interpreters and commentators have felt to be very heavy. The word used by the apostle, *διαθήκη*, signifies generally any kind of contract, agreement, or prescribed arrangement: and therefore it is applied, by common Greek writers, not only to covenants of any kind, but also to *testamentary* dispositions. It is an ancient opinion that, in this latter acceptation the apostle uses it in the passage before us, quitting abruptly the former sense in which he had always before applied it, but returning to that sense immediately after, and never again departing from it. Such a way of dealing with language cannot but appear very extraordinary, and nothing but inextricable necessity could justify us in imputing it to any good writer. Such a necessity is, however, supposed to exist in this case; and is deduced solely from the remaining terms in the passage, which are thought impossible to be applied to any other object than a will rendered valid by the death of a testator. Chrysostom affirms that the apostle ingeniously availed himself of the double sense of the word, in order to meet the objection of weak persons, who might think that the *death* of the Founder of Christianity was a very inauspicious circumstance, going near to the exploding of his claims: the apostle therefore maintains that the matter was quite the reverse, for that the constitution of the gospel might be viewed as a will, which brings a beneficiary interest to legatees only by the death of the person who had made it. *Hom. XVI. in Ep. ad Hebr.*

Though this is the common interpretation, and is supported by ancient and other high authorities, it lies under obvious objections. It is attributing to the apostle the imposing of a new sense upon a word, in the very current of discourse, without notice, and to be quitted immediately after; that sense, though habitual in classical Greek, has not a single example besides in the Hebraized Greek of the Septuagint or the New Testament; it would carry the implication that a will and testament requires a mediator, which would be a strong incongruity, unless μεσίτης be supposed to signify an *executor*, in contradiction to all usage, classical and sacred; the argument would require that the Levitical dispensation should be called "the first testament," though it had nothing in it of a testamentary nature; it would necessitate the rendering of v. 20, "the blood of the testament," an expression either unintelligible or involving inadmissible consequences, as it would attribute death to the Divine Majesty. For these or similar reasons, some eminent scholars have relinquished the entire interpretation, and conceive that there is no necessity for deserting the ordinary scripture sense of διαθήκη. Among these, Peirce, Doddridge, Michaelis, Macknight, Steudel, Paulus, De Wette, and Professor James Scholefield, may be specified as the chief: Whitby also inclines strongly to it. On the other hand, their method of understanding the words is pressed by the necessity of making ὁ διαθέμενος and νεκροὶ to signify the animal sacrifices by which the most solemn covenants in early times were ratified: whereas the phrase διαθέσθαι διαθήκην is common in the Septuagint, and always refers to the act of the person who constitutes the covenant; and νεκροὶ or νεκρὰ is never applied to the dead bodies of any but mankind. Michaelis acknowledges that he can meet these objections in no other way than, as he held the hypothesis of a Hebrew or Syro-Chaldaic original of this Epistle, by supposing that the Greek translator had here fallen into some mistake. Peirce, Newcome, Macknight, and the late Mr Archibald Maclean (a sagacious and judicious commentator) adopt different modes of removing the former difficulty: of the latter they seem not to have been sensible. Michaelis and Mr Greville Ewing, in his excellent Greek Lexicon, conceive that ὁ διαθέμενος is equivalent to μεσίτης just before, and that Christ is expressly intended; but it appears insuperably difficult to give to the attributive a particular relation in a general proposition. Dr Tholuck appears to regard the difficulties as equal and insuperable, on either interpretation. Professor Stuart, Kuinœl, Dr Bloomfield (see his large and elaborate Note in his Gr. Test. vol. ii. *second* ed.), and many other distinguished Bible-scholars, adhere to the older interpretation, that διαθήκη in v. 15, stands in its proper signification for a *covenant*, but in vv. 16, 17, means a *testament*. The deplorable Neologism of H. E. G. Paulus does not destroy the usefulness of him and others like him, as *word-explainers*; but even adds, in many cases, to the probability of a criticism, when it involves some contrariety to their own unhappy prejudices, and when we do not receive it without a strict examination. After explaining vv. 15–17, on the assumption that διαθήκη denotes *covenant* throughout, and disregarding the objection from ἐπὶ νεκροῖς (perhaps thinking that this use might be allowable in Hebraizing Greek), he says: "The sense is this: the Deity is the Founder of the covenant; Jesus, as the middle person, carried this covenant of a spiritual concord into valid effect, that he might thereby bring men out of the sinful state, from which they were not separated by the foregoing covenant, in order to accomplish an actual (ἀπολύτρωσις, v. 15) redemption. But his sacrifice of himself, as it is an historical fact, serves as a token of the solemnity and fixedness of the covenant. From his holy resolution of mind, convinced of the everlasting duration of the Spirit which belonged to himself as the Messiah, he made himself a covenant-sacrifice. He died, according to the true historical course of events, in order to ratify (—not to *make* true, for it was so before, but to *confirm*—) that divine covenant; since he, in death, as he had done in life before Caiaphas and Pilate, maintained the genuineness of his spiritual Messiahship, and, by his constant life-sacrifice of all the highest sensibilities, he became an example demanding and animating to faithfulness in maintaining conviction; and thus also gave an almost necessitating impulse to the diffusion of this divine covenant in all directions beyond the limits of Palestine. The result of all this is, that he had given up himself to the Deity (who, as Founder of the covenant, must set forth a covenant-sacrifice), expressly as the means of confirming and diffusing this covenant among mankind." (*Des Ap. Paul. Ermahn. Schr. Hebr*. p. 97." Heidelb. 1833.)

Melancholy yet instructive it is, to observe the tortuous ingenuity, with which this clever old man seeks to evade the admission of a real propitiation.—Perhaps we must humbly say that this passage is among the "things hard to be understood" of the apostle Paul's writings, and that the satisfactory elucidation of it is not yet attained. But it certainly appears desirable to preserve the same sense of the leading term throughout the paragraph. I conceive, therefore, that I cannot better serve my readers than by giving a close translation of Michaelis's Paraphrase, published in 1762, and of his Version published a little before his death, which took place Aug. 22, 1791. In the Annotations (which upon that part of the Version were posthumous) he refers to the Paraphrase and its ample Notes, for the fuller confirmation of his opinion; thus showing that he had not changed his views. That he might not appear too positive, he adopted the expedient of giving two Versions of the difficult portion. The reader will, with perhaps the more advantage, read his paraphrase first.

Paraphrase of Heb. ix. 15–23. "15. To acquire for us this joyful state, he has become the Mediator of a new covenant, in order that, after the infliction of death, for the expiation of the transgressions which, during the first covenant, remained unexpiated, those who are called might receive the promised inheritance and everlasting possession in heaven. 16. For, where a covenant is made, it is requisite, according to the customs of the nations, that the covenant-offering should suffer death. 17. By corpses and lifeless bodies the covenant first becomes valid in law: but so long as the mediating sacrifice of consecration is not slain, the covenant is not binding, and either of the parties making it may change his mind and retract. 18. So likewise the solemn confirmation of the first covenant was not without blood. 19. But when Moses had read the commandments, as they are stated in the law, to the deputies of the whole nation, he took blood of oxen and goats mixed with water, and, by means of a bundle of hyssop tied with purple-coloured wool, he sprinkled it upon the book of the covenant, and upon the deputies of the nation, pronouncing these words, 20. *This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath prescribed to you.* 21. In like manner did he also afterwards sprinkle with blood the tabernacle and all the furniture for divine service: 22. and it is a principle almost universal, that, according to the law, everything is purified with blood, and without blood-shedding there is no forgiveness of sins. 23. Such sacrifices the earthly tabernacle required, which was an image of the heavenly one: but when sacrificial blood was to be brought into the great temple of heaven, it was requisite to be of a nobler nature than that of bullocks and goats.——"

Version. 15. "And therefore he is the Mediator of a new covenant, that, after the infliction of death for the expiation of the trangressions under the first covenant, those who are called may obtain the promised eternal inheritance.

16. For, where a testament is, it is necessary that the death of the person who made it should be proved; 17. for only by death is a testament valid, and it takes not effect so long as the testator liveth: 18. therefore also the first was not consecrated without blood:	For, where a covenant is, the death of the sacrifice by which the covenant was made must follow; for only by death doth a covenant become valid, and it is not of binding power while the covenant-sacrifice is still living: therefore also the first tabernacle was not consecrated without blood;

19. For after Moses had read to the people all the commandments, as they stand in the law, he took the blood of bullocks and goats with water, scarlet wool, and hyssop, and the book itself, sprinkled the whole people, and said, 20. This is the blood of the covenant [*or* testament] which God hath commanded you. 21. Also the tabernacle and all the furniture of divine service sprinkled he in like manner with blood; 22. and, according to the prescription of the law, almost everything is purified with blood, and without blood-shedding is no forgiveness. 23. Thus it was necessary that the image of the sanctuary in heaven should be purified by means of such sacrifices; but the heavenly sanctuary itself, by nobler sacrifices than those are."

But, whatever interpretation be adopted upon the difficult part of this passage, its bearing as a whole upon our present subject of inquiry remains nearly the same. It represents to us the Mediatorship of our Blessed Saviour as necessarily requiring for the foundation of its efficacy, that he should die; that his death should be under the precise character of a sacrifice of expiation; and that this sacrifice would effectuate the forgiveness of sins, a participation of all the blessings of God's gracious purpose and promise, and such a moral change on those who had been defiled and rendered abominable by sin, as would lead them to be rightfully admitted into the heavenly state, while that pure and holy state would incur no desecration by their presence.

"Mediator of the new covenant." xii. 24. Here also the connexion illustrates the design of this description. It plainly represents Jesus as the effectual *medium* of procuring the highest blessings which the majesty of "the Living God," and the equity of "the Judge of all" can bestow. The connexion of this with the next and concluding article of the most grand and beautiful enumeration that was ever penned, cannot be unnoticed. It is a common effect of the association of ideas, especially in impassioned diction, to place subjects in a co-ordinate enumeration, whose connexion with each other does not rest upon a logical parity, but is the result of sequence, dependence, or effect. According to this idiom, "the blood of sprinkling" is to be understood in a most important connexion with "the Mediator Jesus." Heinrichs, a penetrating and judicious interpreter, though sometimes rash and tinctured, I fear, with the system falsely called rationalism, regards it as "a hendiadys, instead of this form, *The Mediator who hath sprinkled us with his blood.*" I cannot refrain from adding Michaelis's Paraphrase, and some part of his Note.

Paraphrase. "Ye have the Mediator of the new covenant, Jesus; and a sacrificial blood, with which ye are sprinkled and expiated, which cries, not as Abel's blood for vengeance, but for pardon on the behalf of even those who shed it."

Note. "——The 'blood of sprinkling' signifies the *sacrificial blood* with which persons were sprinkled. The old covenant had (as Paul remarks, ch. ix. 18–22, from Exod. xxiv. 8) this sprinkling of blood; but it was unable to take away sin.—The new covenant has also its sprinkling of blood, and a nobler one indeed, which speaks for us after the death of the sacrifice, and makes its legal application to God for pardon. In this respect, Paul compares it with the blood of Abel, which too was precious in the sight of God, and on that account is described as speaking after his death. On the other hand, the unworthy blood of beasts might flow in streams, and yet, like the beasts themselves, it remained dumb; it called for neither vengeance nor pardon.——The comparison of the atoning blood of Christ with the vengeance-crying blood of Abel might appear feeble, if we did not advert to the particular occasion of the allusion.—The apostle was writing to Hebrews, of whom many, or their fathers, had been the actual murderers of Christ. In an epistle to such a church, which might still recollect the dreadful cry, 'His blood be upon us and our children!' the sentiment was introduced with peculiar propriety, that THIS BLOOD speaks very differently from that of Abel, which cried for vengeance; it implores forgiveness, not only for mankind in general, but even and in particular for the murderers who shed it!"

x. Ἀρχηγός. "*Author* of salvation." ii. 10. "*Author* and Perfecter of faith." xii. 2. "*Author* of life." Acts iii. 15. "*Prince* and Saviour." ib. v. 31. The undoubted meaning of this word is an *intelligent and active cause* of the subjoined state or quality. In each of the passages, the Lord Jesus is so denominated in a declared connexion with his *sufferings and death*, clearly showing that this high dignity belongs to him in consequence of his being a propitiatory sacrifice, and a reconciling High-Priest. See what was remarked before on ch. v. 9. As he could not be himself *accomplished* (τελειωθεὶς) so as to be a suitable and adequate Saviour, without those *peculiar* sufferings which were appointed for him and which he voluntarily undertook, so he is *the Accomplisher* (ὁ τελειωτὴς), who completes true religion in the character of sincere believers, and confers upon them the perfect fulness of blessings of which their faith is the initiating principle; and this faith, which respects himself as having "endured the cross," is his own gift. "He put the faith in us: he gave its beginning." *Chrysost. Homil.* xxviii. *in Ep. Hebr.* The same father remarks on Acts iii. 15, "It follows that he had not [τὸ ζῆν] the property of life from another. As the phrase, *author of wickedness* (1 Macc. ix. 61) denotes the person who produced the wickedness; and *author of murder* [ἀρχηγὸς φόνου] him who first introduced murder; so the phrase *Author of life* denotes him who hath life from himself." *Homil.* ix. *in Acta Ap.* Clemens of Alexandria calls the Blessed God, ἁπάντων Ἀρχηγὸς ἀγαθῶν, *Author of all good.* See *Suiceri Thesaur. Eccl.* and *Schleusneri Lexic. in LXX. in voc.* We find a very elucidating instance in 1 Macc. x. 47, where it is said of Alexander Balas, that "he became (ἀρχηγὸς λόγων εἰρηνικῶν) the *first mover* of peaceful negotiations." The last of the N. T. instances above mentioned, Acts v. 31, is considered by Heinrichs as an instance of the very frequent Hebraism, hendiadys; and therefore to be precisely equivalent to Heb. ii. 10, with which concurs the late Professor Dindorf, a judicious critic, partly but not altogether of the Ernestine school. But the other explication is plain and obvious, simple and satisfactory; and it is founded upon unquestionable reason and usage. From the idea of a beginner, author, efficient, that of a *leader* in any combination of powers or persons is naturally derived; and such a leader is a prince, chief, captain, or lord, as the case may be. In this sense the word occurs repeatedly, and indeed it is the most usual application of it, in the Septuagint. The verdict of the whole clearly is, that *Christ, by virtue of his sufferings and death, is the* CAUSE *of salvation;* in subordination, of course, to the great and supreme cause, the sovereign grace and mercy of God the Father.

xi. Though the appellative *Saviour* (Σωτὴρ) does not occur in the Ep. to the Hebrews, yet its ideas are so plainly included in other words, that we may justly regard it as belonging to this enumeration. To the passages already mentioned, this must be added: "Wherefore he is able even to *save* to the uttermost, those who come unto God through him, seeing he is ever living to *intercede* for them." vii. 25. Here the perfect and never-decaying powers of Christ, as a Saviour, and our absolute dependence upon him for attaining the great end of our existence,—are inferred (ὅθεν) from his perpetual and intransferable (ἀπαράβατος) priesthood. v. 24. His being a Saviour, then, is *the same* thing as his being a Priest: his efficiency in *delivering* those who rely upon him *from all evil* whether of sin or of suffering (the proper idea of salvation), arises from the acts and office of his priesthood, of which his giving himself a sacrifice is so repeatedly and strongly set before us as the principal and essential.

xii. In this passage, also, the *intercession* of Christ is laid down as the correlate of his perfect ability to save. The principal passages besides, in which this subject is stated, are ch. iv. 14. vi 20. viii. 1. ix. 24. John xiv. 2, 3. Rom. viii. 34. 1 John ii. 1. The symbolical allusion is to the annual appearance of the Hebrew high-priest before the representation of the Divine Presence in the most holy place. The reader will recollect what has before been said on the figure of *sitting at the right hand.* We are not to conceive of the intercession of Christ as if it involved anything imperfect, precarious, or degrading. The words ἐντυγχάνειν and ἔντευξίς are of a very general signification; and when connected with ὑπὲρ (for with κατὰ the effect is reversed; see Rom. xi. 2), include all possible modes of acting on the behalf and for the benefit of others. The precise nature and vast extent of those modes, in which the all-originating love of the Father, the merit of the Son, and the influence of the Holy Spirit, are developed in their ever-new and wondrous energies, we are not qualified to conceive. They are infinitely above our power of thought; "the glory which shall be revealed, —the things not seen and eternal." We are sure that they include all the modes of good, and that they are infinitely worthy of the Eternal Majesty of heaven. But the point of our present reference to the intercession of Christ, lies in this, that it is an act of his glorious priesthood, in which "he offered up HIMSELF." v. 27. The law term used by Jews and Greeks and Romans, παράκλητος, is by implication declared to be a title of the Lord Jesus, in his own gracious words, John xiv. 16, where he calls the promised Spirit "*another* Comforter;" and it is again applied to the Saviour in 1 John ii. 1. The word strongly impresses the ideas of our immense interest at stake, our incapacity to maintain it, our dependence on a powerful Patron, and his ability, fidelity, and generosity inexhaustible: but all these ideas, at once so humbling and so consoling, are shown to *rest upon the great fact* that this our Mighty Patron has offered up himself as a propitiatory sacrifice. "*These things I write unto you that ye sin not;* the whole design and tendency of the doctrine of grace and redemption is to counteract and extirpate sin both in the mind and in practice: *but if*, through the deceptive appearances of, things, or sudden surprisal, or the melancholy infirmities and still remaining corruptions of our nature, *any one should sin, we have an Advocate* [translated by Luther, whose taste and judgment in his immortal version will never cease to be admired, *Fürsprecher*, spokesman, intercessor, deprecator; and Michaelis, Knapp, and Van Ess, retain the word as the most exact representative of the original], *with the Father Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is a propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world.*" The studious inquirer would read, with great satisfaction, the late learned and pious Dr Knapp's Dissertation *de Spiritu Sancto et Christo Paracletis, item de Variâ Potestate Vocabulorum* παρακαλεῖν, παράκλησις, et παράκλητος, in his *Scripta Varii Argumenti*, vol. i. Halle, 1805.

xiii. *Forerunner*, πρόδρομος. "— The [most holy place] within the veil, whither [as] Forerunner on our behalf is entered Jesus, made a High-Priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec." vi. 20. The heavenly world is described, as in other passages, by allusion to the most sacred part of the sanctuary: and into that state of purity and happiness the Saviour is declared to have entered, as the first personage, the official Chief and Representative of all his faithful followers, taking possession and acting on their behalf.

How clearly does this answer to his own words! "In my Father's house are many mansions: I go to prepare a place for you: and if I go and prepare a place for you, again I will come and receive you to myself, that where I am ye also may be." John xiv. 3. When our Lord thus said, "I go," he was on the eve of his greatest sufferings and his death. Through that dreadful gate was he of necessity to go, in order to bring his many sons to glory. The same idea is presented to us in this passage of the Epistle. Christ's entering the heavenly sanctuary as our Forerunner, is evidently the same act as his "entering into the holy place, by his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption." This, therefore, is but another view of the great case which is continually coming before us: it manifestly coincides with the preceding representations, and concurs with them in pointing to the sacrificial oblation of our Divine High-Priest, as the necessary and sole method by which sinful mortals can attain the dignity and blessedness of heaven.

xiv. *Great Shepherd.* "The God of peace, who, by the blood of the everlasting covenant, brought again from the dead the Great Shepherd of the sheep, our Lord Jesus, make you perfect."—etc. xiii. 20, 21. There are at least two ways of connecting the clause which assigns the cause, manner, or instrument, with the rest of the sentence. Many able interpreters attach it to the epithet, and understand it as giving the reason of that epithet; thus, that Jesus is 'the Great Shepherd by the blood of the everlasting covenant;' that is, his power and presidency as the Only Saviour, is in consequence of his death, which fulfilled the eternal purpose of divine mercy. Others regard the clause as assigning the meritorious cause for which the God of reconciliation brought back the Saviour to life, not by mere power, but in the exercise of judicial rectitude: he brought Jesus from the state of the dead, by virtue of the blood of the everlasting covenant; thereby declaring the perfection and full validity of the expiatory sacrifice. Thus the sentiment is the same as in Rom. iv. 25. Michaelis, differing from most of his countrymen who prefer the former interpretation, strenuously supports the latter, in both his works on the Epistle. He thinks that this interpretation is rendered certain by the allusion which he believes the apostle to have made to Zech. ix. 11, 12, a clear prophecy of the Messiah and the blessings of his reign. "As here the prisoners of Zion are released on account of *the blood of the covenant*, out of the prison, called a pit without water, so Christ is brought again from the dead on account of *the blood of the everlasting covenant;* that is, because he had shed his precious blood, and thereby had established for mankind an everlasting covenant, of which it was a principal provision that they should have in him an everlasting King and an everlasting Advocate. Let it also be recollected, that the promise of the everlasting kingdom of the Messiah is represented as an *everlasting covenant* made with David; and that this is elsewhere applied by Paul to the resurrection of Christ: Acts xiii. 34, compared with Is. lv. 3." *Erklärung*, p. 410. "The blood of Christ, by which he has made for us an everlasting covenant with God, was a full satisfaction for our sins; and therefore he was brought again from death. It is the very same subject that we have met with and illustrated in Rom. iv. 24, 25." *Anmerk. in loc.* "Who was delivered up to death on account of our sins, and was raised again on account of our justification.—Paul states the matter thus: Christ suffered and died for our sins, as he, by his sufferings and death, has paid to the righteousness of God a full satisfaction;

we are therefore declared righteous; and therefore now our Surety, who hath paid the penalty for us, and on whom any more than upon ourselves no further demand or claim of penalty remains, is raised from the dead." *Uebersetz. u. Anmerk. zu Rom.* iv. 25.

The observant reader will not fail to notice that this pre-eminent Biblical scholar, whom some Unitarians in our country have been forward to admire and commend, as if he in some sort belonged to them, had no difficulty in admitting the representation of the Atonement which is derived from the practice of fines, debts, and legal commutations in human societies: a mode of statement which among us has been disfigured by much misconception and misrepresentation. See some further remarks in Disc. IV.

The very strong and decisive bearing of the passage under consideration, upon our present inquiry, is evident. The character of Christ signified by the ancient figure of a Shepherd, and which holds him forth as the Sovereign and Protector of his people (Is. xl. 10, 11. Ezek. xxxiv. 11–31), is plainly shown to rest upon the sacrifice of his blood as its basis of validity. The Good Shepherd, whose OWN the sheep are, *laid down his life* for them: and his return to life proved that his devoting himself to death was accepted and efficacious.

xv. *Son of God.*——"But Christ [is faithful] as a Son over his" [God's, *αὐτοῦ* being the best supported reading, not *αὑτοῦ*] "household; whose household we are.—" iii. 6. Here the connexion carries us immediately to the beginning of the argument (v. 1, 2), the faithfulness of Christ *as High-Priest.*

"Having then a Great High-Priest who is passed into the Heavens, Jesus the Son of God." iv. 14. See the observations under § ii. The infinite benefit arising from the benevolence and power of this Divine Person, is here again shown to have its inseparable association with his function as the supreme and only real Priest: and let it be ever remembered that "the *essential idea* of a priest is—to be the presenter of sacrifices, and the propitiator for sins, with God." *Michaelis, Anmerk. zu Heb.* v. 1.

"So also Christ assumed not to himself the honour of becoming High-Priest; but HE [conferred it] who said to him, 'Thou art my Son; this day I have begotten thee:' as also in another [Psalm], 'Thou art a Priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec.'" v. 5, 6. The judgment of the Almighty Father decides that none is worthy or competent for this office of the TRUE priesthood, except "the Only Begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father:" and whom "no one knoweth but the Father." Joh. i. 18. Matt. xi. 27.

"Though he was the Son, yet he learned, from the sufferings which he endured, the obedience;" *i.e.* the particular kind of obedience which was necessary for the purposes of his mediatorial undertaking. See above, § ii.

"The law constituteth high-priests men who possess infirmity: but the declaration of the oath, which took place after the law, [constituteth] the Son who is made perfect for ever." vii. 28. The contrast is, between physical and moral weakness, a decaying, dying, and sinful nature, and the qualities of immortality, inherent dignity, and sinless perfection; between a temporary and successional constitution, and one that is fixed for ever by the oath of God (Ps. cx. 4); and between a series of mere men, and the one ever-during High-Priest, the Son of God. Michaelis's paraphrase is, "The law maketh feeble and mortal men to be priests; but the word of the oath which supersedes the law, not mere men but the Son of God, who is consecrated to be an everlasting Priest." *Erklärung*, p. 214.

"—Crucifying to themselves again the Son of God, and holding him up to insult and ignominy." vi. 6. "—Who hath trampled upon the Son of God, and hath esteemed as an impure thing the blood of the covenant by which he was sanctified." x. 29. This is contemning and rejecting the propitiation, the central fact of Christianity. Unspeakably dreadful as is this crime, on account of the dignity of the Person whom it outrages, it is plainly represented as acquiring a more dreadful aggravation still, from the consideration of the nature and design of his death; and the condition of such persons, as being hopeless of pardon and conversion, is expressly declared to arise from the fact that "there remaineth no more any sacrifice for sins." A more heart-touching testimony could not be given to the reality of the sacrifice of Christ, and the necessity of our practically receiving it with a devotional confidence, if we would escape eternal ruin.

xvi. Terms of dignity are accumulated, so as to bear with the fullest effect upon the value of the great propitiation. This is the case in that which Heinrichs calls "a most noble and sublime passage, in which the Divine Nature of Christ is not indeed formally brought forwards, as in other passages, but is placed as in a vivid picture before our eyes."[1] The Son of God is displayed in his divine perfection, his all-creating and all-sustaining power, and his universal dominion; so as to produce ideas infinitely above all human, all created grandeur. But, in the mind of a Jew, the objection was at hand, How could this greatness and glory be affirmed of one who was so low in appearance, so mean in his circumstances, so wretched and degraded in his miserable and ignominious death? Was not Jesus despised and rejected, disesteemed and insulted, smitten of God and afflicted? To destroy this objection, the apostle puts into the current of his discourse *the reason* of this depressed and humbled condition: a reason which exalts still higher the glory of the Messiah, as it shows his grace and mercy to be equal to his majesty: "He hath, by his own self, made purification of our sins." The term *purification* (*καθαρισμὸς*) is used by the LXX. for the Hebrew כִּפֻּרִים *atonement* or *expiation*, put in the plural to express completeness: Exod. xxix. 36. xxx. 10; and the participle occurs in this sense in ch. x. 2 of this Epistle. Such atonement it is here declared that Christ made "by his own self" (*δι' ἑαυτου*), an expression which denotes the intrinsic value and efficacy of his sacrifice; in contrast with those which "could never take away sins," or "make those who came to them perfect" by giving them the evidence and comfort of acceptance before the just tribunal of God.

---

[1] Egregius profectò et sublimis locus, in quo Divina Christi Natura non quidem disertè, ut in aliis locis, adducitur, sed graphicè tamen pingitur. *Heb.* i. 2, 3. *Nov. Test. Koppian.* vol. viii. p. 38.

This enumeration has now included, if I mistake not, every appellative and epithet which is given, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, to our Blessed Lord, under any aspect or relation to his mediatorial character.

II. The second branch of this analysis regards those *properties and descriptive characters* which are attributed to the Priesthood of Christ.

These attributives are so much involved in the appellations given to Christ, that they have to a great degree been considered already. Little more, therefore, than a recital will be required.

i. The priesthood of the Lord Jesus is *sole and* *unique.* He has no partner, rival, or successor, in this office. This fact is so manifestly implied in the whole strain of the apostle's discussion, that it needed not a formal statement. I insert therefore only two sentences; and they have been elucidated above. "And they were indeed many [successive] priests, on account of their being prevented by death from continuing: but he, on account of his continuing for ever, hath the priesthood which can never pass to another.—For the law constituteth priests men who have infirmity; but the declaration of the oath, which took place after the law, [constituteth] the Son who is made perfect for ever."—vii. 23, 24, 28.

ii. His priesthood is *perfect;* that is, it is *real*, and not metaphorical or symbolical as was the priesthood of those "who performed the sacred services in a model and shadow of the heavenly [sanctuary"]; viii. 5,—possessed of *all moral excellence;* vii. 26,—and fully *suited* to all the ends and purposes intended to be answered by it; iv. 15. v. 9. vii. 25, 28. viii. 6. ix. 14–28. x. 9, 14.

iii. His sacrifice, the chief object of his priesthood, though comprehending all the sufferings which he endured in his state of abasement, from his birth among men, his infant dangers, and his private sorrows, yet was matured, completed, and presented as an *expiation* for the sins of mankind and a *propitiation* to secure the honour of the divine government, by his painful and violent DEATH: which, having once taken place, needs not and cannot ever be repeated.

"Who hath not every day need, like the high-priests [of the Levitical institution], first for his own sins to offer sacrifices, and then for those of the people: for this he hath done once, offering himself." vii. 27.[1]

[1] On the absurd and blasphemous idea that Christ offered for his own sins, see Supplementary Note XVIII.

"Not that he should offer himself often, as the high-priest entered into the holy place every year with blood [not his own, but that] of another: for in that case he must have suffered often from the beginning of the world. But now, once, at the completion of the ages [*i.e.* the former dispensations] he hath been manifested for the abolition of sin by the sacrifice of himself. And, as it is appointed unto men to die once, and after that [followeth] judgment, so Christ, having been offered once to bear the sins of many, will appear the second time without sin [*i.e.* not again to bear the sins of men], for salvation [*i.e.* full and final], to those who wait for him." ix. 25–28. "We are consecrated to God [the true idea of ἡγιασμένοι, particularly in this Epistle] through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once." x. 10. In the first and last of these passages, *once* is not an adequate translation of ἐφ' ἅπαξ or ἐφάπαξ. It denotes, emphatically, the absolute cessation of an act under the idea that it has been perfectly performed; and it would be better rendered by our common phrases, were they not too colloquial, *once for all* or *once for ever;* and the former, which is adopted in our common version, is apt to be taken in another sense, which, though a truth, is not the object intended here. "He, having offered one sacrifice for sins unto perpetuity, is seated at the right hand of God." v. 12.

iv. The dignity and merit, power and authority of the Messiah, in his exalted state, imply a continued *presentation* of his obedience and sacrifice as *ever valid and efficacious*, for the pardon and acceptance, the perfected holiness and the eternal happiness, of all who are truly penitent, believing, and obedient. This is Christ's *Intercession*, or his acting as the High-Priest in the heavenly world; and it was represented by the

Hebrew high-priest's entering into the most holy place, on the annual day of atonement, with the fragrant incense burning, and with the sacrificial blood which he was to sprinkle upon the mercy-seat, over the ark of the covenant, and before the awful symbols of Jehovah's presence. But, with the resemblance, there were also capital points of dissimilitude and contrast. The figurative high-priest approached the symbolical presence of God once only in a year; the true and effective High-Priest is without intermission acting in his function:—he offered for his own sins, as well as for those of his brethren; Christ needeth not to do so, for he was without spot:—he offered foreign blood; Christ offers his own:—he stood before the presence of Jehovah, as a waiting-servant; Christ sits down at the right hand of the throne, the symbolical expression to denote his possessing and exercising supreme dignity and authority:—he speedily quitted the sacred place, and proved, by his own experience and that of others, the want of substance and efficiency in his services, as to a moral effect; Christ abideth in the heavenly sanctuary, effectually answering all the purposes of his mediation, reigning and saving, "a priest upon his throne," conferring every blessing upon his faithful subjects, and defeating all the machinations of his enemies:—he ministered on the behalf of only one small nation; Christ is the "propitiation for the sins of the whole world:"—he acted in the routine of a temporary establishment; Christ is the High-Priest "after the power of an endless life:"—he was a frail and sinful, feeble and dying man; "Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him; he is holy, harmless, undefiled, separated from sinners, made higher than the heavens, made perfect through sufferings, consecrated for evermore;" he is the Son and Lord over his redeemed and reconciled family, the brightness of the glory of God and the express image of his manner of existence, whom all the Church and all the angels of God worship, and to whom he saith, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever!"

The passages upon which this comparison is founded either have been cited already, or they are so obvious as not to need a formal insertion.

v. The *effects* produced by this glorious arrangement of divine wisdom, holiness, and grace, are stated to be the following:—

1. Ratifying the gospel-covenant, that is, the revealed purpose and plan of God for the salvation of sinful and justly-condemned mankind. "The surety of a superior covenant.—The Mediator of a superior covenant which hath been established upon superior promises.—The Mediator of the new covenant.—He taketh away the first thing [the whole body or system of the Mosaic sacrifices], that he may establish the second" [his own perfect sacrifice, consonant to the will of God]. vii. 22. viii. 6. ix. 15. x. 7–9.

2. Christ's enjoying the rewards due from the righteousness of the divine government, to his meritorious obedience. Of these rewards, the most grand and gratifying to his exalted benevolence is the *right of conferring infinite and everlasting blessings* upon an inconceivable multitude of sinful and otherwise lost men, in unison with securing and displaying the brightest glory of the divine perfections. "The Author of eternal salvation to all those who obey him.—Wherefore, he is able to save to the uttermost [the most perfectly, in every sense] those who approach to God through him. —The service of the Living God;—the redemption;— the promise of the eternal inheritance." v. 9. vii. 25.

ix. 14, 15, 28. x. 10–18; besides other passages and the general tenor of the Epistle, all leading us to continue "looking unto Jesus, the Author and the Finisher of our faith, who, FOR THE JOY that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is sat down at the right hand of the throne of God." xii. 2. "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of RIGHTEOUSNESS is the sceptre of thy kingdom! Thou hast loved righteousness and hast hated iniquity: THEREFORE, O God,[1] thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy companions!" i. 8, 9. See also Matt. xi. 27. John i. 12. xvii. 2.

3. The legal *reconciliation* of God and all sinners who cordially receive the gospel method of salvation. This all-important idea is presented under two aspects:—

(1.) *Expiation* or *atonement.* This denotes the doing of something which shall furnish a *just ground* or *reason* in a system of judicial administration, for *pardoning* a convicted offender.

(2.) *Propitiation:* anything which shall have the property of disposing, inclining, or causing the judicial authority to *admit* the expiation; *i. e.* to assent to it as a valid reason for pardoning the offender.

---

[1] Heretofore, I have not ventured to render ὁ Θεὸς, here, in the vocative; but the judgment and example of Michaelis, Dindorf, the younger Rosenmüller, and the recent Lausanne version or revision, Kuinöl, and even De Wette (in his German version, 1831), have emboldened me to follow. Yet it cannot be absolutely either proved or disproved: either translation is agreeable to both the Hebrew and the Greek. In the phrase *oil of gladness*, the allusion is to the ancient Asiatic custom of pouring upon the heads of the guests, after a splendid feast, a small quantity of a very costly and exquisitely fragrant oil; and the highest measure of honour intended to be conferred upon an individual, was signified by the greater copiousness of this perfume. The imagery in the xlvth Psalm, is that of a royal bridal feast, in which the bridegroom's table is graced by the presence of other kings; but he has the pre-eminence above them all. In the oriental style, kingdoms and governments were called brides, and the inauguration of a sovereign was a marriage or a marriage-feast. Taking away the metaphor, the sense of the last clause will be of this kind, "God hath pointed thee out as the Saviour and Sovereign of thy redeemed people, by the superabundance of the most valuable endowments and qualifications, distinguishing thee above all other rulers, instructors, or deliverers."

Expiation therefore regards the condition of the offender; propitiation, that of the judge or sovereign. We can conceive cases in which an expiation, good and reasonable in its kind, might be offered, and yet a wise and good government might not be willing to accept it; *i. e.* might not be *propitious* to the offender and to the proposal for his being forgiven. We can also conceive of a wise and good government being cordially disposed and greatly desirous to pardon an offender; but unable to gratify this gracious disposition, because it can find *no just grounds* for such an act, and it is aware that a pardon arbitrary and destitute of unexceptionable reason would relax the obligations of law, bring dishonour upon public justice, and prove of pernicious example throughout the whole community.

It is also obvious that *the same* thing *may* be, and is most naturally *fit* and likely to be, *both* an expiation and a propitiation; *i. e.* be both a valid *reason* for pardoning, and a determining *motive* to the will of the competent authority to admit and act upon that reason.

Now, in applying these terms to the great and awful case of ourselves, the whole world of justly condemned sinners, and our Judge, the infinitely Perfect God, there are some cautions of great importance to be observed.

(1.) Nothing can be admitted that would contradict incontrovertible first principles. But there are two such principles, which are often violated by inconsiderate advocates of the doctrine of salvation by the mediation of Christ; and the violation of them has afforded the advantage of all the plausible arguments urged against that doctrine by its adversaries.

The first is, the Immutability of God. His moral principles, that is, his rectitude, wisdom, and goodness, as expressed by his blessed and holy *will*, can undergo no alteration; for to admit such a supposition would be destructive of the ABSOLUTE PERFECTION of the divine nature, as it would imply either an improvement or a deterioration in the subject of the supposed change. We cannot, therefore, hear, or read, without unspeakable disapprobation and regret, representations of the Deity as first actuated by the passions of wrath and fury towards sinful men, and as afterwards turned, by the presentation of the Saviour's sacrifice, into a different temper, a disposition of calmness, kindness, and grace.

The second foundation-principle is, that the Adorable God is, from eternity and in all the glorious constancy of his nature, gracious and merciful. He wants no extraneous motive to induce him to pity and relieve our miserable world. No change in God is necessary or desirable, if even it were possible. This is abundantly evident from many parts of the divine word: *e. g.* Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7. John iii. 16. vi. 39. x. 17. Eph. i. 3–10. 2 Cor. v. 18, 19.

(2.) This concern is entirely one of Law and Administrative Wisdom. The great God is, in the unalterable nature of things, and from the necessary volitions of an infinitely perfect mind, the Righteous Ruler of the universe, intellectual as well as physical. Over the latter he rules according to certain fixed principles, some of which he has enabled mortals to discover; and they have called them *Laws of nature.* Over the universe of intellectual beings, who act from volitions and are governed by motives, he rules also according to certain fixed principles; and these are the *Laws of the moral world.* Our knowledge of them is derived from himself; partly as he has implanted them in the moral instincts of our nature, partly as he has made them discoverable by our reasoning powers, and partly as he has given them clear expression by the voice of revelation.

The question, whether sinners shall be pardoned, is not one that can be referred to arbitrary will or absolute power. It is a question of law and government; and it is to be solved by the dictates of wisdom, goodness, justice, and consistency. God's disposition to show mercy is original and unchangeable: in this sense nothing is needed to *render* him propitious. But the way and manner, in which it will be suitable to all the other considerations proper to be taken into the account, that he should show mercy, *none but* HIMSELF *is qualified to determine.* To deny this would be manifest folly and impiety. Now we have found, and the design of this volume is to present the evidence on the case, that HE *has determined* upon this matter; and that he has given us to know that pardoning and restoring mercy shall be exercised *in the way* of MEDIATION and EXPIATION.

From these facts it clearly follows, that a phraseology derived from the administration of government and law is proper and necessary, in all our considerations upon this, the most momentous and interesting of all concerns. "God is the Righteous Judge: and God is angry [with the wicked] every day." But this anger is not a commotion or a mutable passion: it is the calm, dignified, unchangeable, and eternal majesty of the JUDGE; it is his *necessary* love of righteousness and hatred of iniquity. In this his rectoral capacity, therefore, the maintenance of law, the enforcement of equity in relation to the unchangeable distinction of right and wrong, is not a matter of neutrality or of option; and it involves the necessity of marking sin with a *suitable* demonstration of its moral evil, and of the displeasure with which it is regarded by the Eternal Jehovah; and *this* is *punishment.* The execution of such punishment, which having been determined by unerring goodness and wisdom, cannot but be strictly proper, must follow in the regular course of moral antecedents and consequents. The promulgation of this course is a *threatening;* and it is rendered proper by a regard equally to the honour of the government and to the benefit of the governed. Threatening and punishment impress justly and necessarily with the idea of the displeasure of the Lawgiver and Judge. Pardon, when, on any consideration, it takes place, brings the true and just idea of a *change:* but that change, in the great case before us, is not in the mind or character of the Supreme Ruler; but it is in the administration of his government, and in those outward acts by which that administration is indicated. This change is, in the order of moral right, the effect of an adequate *cause.* This cause lies in the whole Mediatorial work of the Lord Jesus Christ, but most particularly and essentially in his sufferings and death; and these have constituted the EXPIATION.

Let it also be remembered that this method of "grace reigning through righteousness" has not come from any extraneous influence, in its invention, suggestion, or operation. It is the pure and sole emanation of the FATHER'S *infinite, eternal, and unchangeable* LOVE. It is the exercise of *free and sovereign beneficence.*

It also follows that the terms, *anger*, *indignation*, *wrath*, *sentence*, *threatening*, *punishment*, *remission*, *reconciliation*, *propitiation*, and similar expressions, are, under all the circumstances, most proper to be employed, and are the best calculated to produce a just sense of the evil of sin, and many other salutary feelings; yet that we should be careful to understand them as expressing *modes* of the divine administration, and *effects* of the divine counsels, but *not affections operating upon* the Divine Nature, nor *changes* in it. A creature who is under the guilt and dominion of sin, stands in that position, with respect to the necessary and unchangeable attributes of God, which is fitly expressed by terms denoting the strongest displeasure and abhorrence. A change of state and character, so as to be brought into a new set of relations to the divine attributes, is as fitly expressed by the language of love and approbation. For example: "God is jealous and the Lord revengeth, the Lord revengeth and is furious, the Lord will take vengeance on his adversaries, and he reserveth wrath for his enemies.—Who can stand before his indignation?—The Lord is good, a strong hold in the day of trouble, and he knoweth them that trust in him." Nahum i. 3–7. "And in that day thou shalt say, O Lord, I will praise thee: for thou wast angry with me; thine anger is turned away, and thou hast comforted me!" Is. xii. 1. Upon a different application of the same general principle, the varied dispensations of God's righteous providence towards his sincere though imperfect people are represented by similar expressions, yet all referring to modes and effects of the divine administration. "O Lord, according to all thy righteousness, I beseech thee, let thine anger and thy fury be turned away!" Dan. ix. 16. "Thus saith thy Lord, Jehovah, even thy God who pleadeth the cause of his people, Behold, I have taken out of thine hand the cup of trembling, the dregs of the cup of my fury; thou shalt not drink it any more." Is. li. 22. Yet we are not warranted to understand such passages as these, as indicating a real change in God; any more than we should be to believe that he is the subject of hope, of fear, of precarious expectation, of wishes, of disappointment, and of regrets, because, in condescension to human infirmity, and to the state of mental culture in the infancy of the human race, the external forms of the divine dispensations are described in language borrowed from those affections in men: *e.g.* Gen. ii. 19. iii. 22. vi. 6. Deut. xxxii. 19, 27, 29. Is. v. 4; and many other passages.

The *change* by which a guilty and polluted sinner becomes freed from the sentence of condemnation, pardoned, regarded with complacency, and qualified for the noblest employments and delights, *is not in God;* but it is in the *relations* under which the sinner stands towards God, and in the state of *his own mind and character* consequent upon those altered relations.

The importance of the subject must furnish my apology for having so much extended these observations. I have only to add, that passages which express the doctrine laid down in this part of the apostolic writings, on the reconciliation of sinners to God, as an effect of the sacrifice and an act of the priesthood of Christ, have been already cited, under different heads: consequently it is only requisite to give their notation. ch. i. 3. ii. 9, 17. vii. 27. ix. 12, 26, 28. x. 10, 12, 14. xii. 24. xiii. 20.

4. It is another effect of the sacrifice of Christ, that those who sincerely receive and rely upon it, become *entitled* to the blessings of salvation, in all their fulness and extent. ii. 17, 18. iv. 16. vi. 17–20. xii. 22–24. "We have an altar, to eat from which, they who minister in the [Jewish] tabernacle have not a right." xiii. 10. It is probable that θυσιαστήριον is here put, by a natural metonymy, for the sacrifice which was offered upon the altar. Under the typical law, the ministering priests had certain portions assigned to them of the inferior and private sacrifices: but of those greater sacrifices, the burnt-offerings which were the most public and solemn expiations for sin, and whose blood therefore was taken into the most holy place by the

high-priest (v. 11), on the great annual atonement, they had no participation; the whole was consumed by fire, part upon the appropriated altar, and part at the outside of the encampment, so long as the Israelites were in the wilderness, and afterwards without the precincts of the temple. (See Exod. xxix. 10–14. Lev. xvi. 6, 11, 14, 27.) Now the apostle represents the great High-Priest of Christianity offering up himself *as a sacrifice of this last kind*, the most public, solemn, sacred, and expiatory. "Wherefore also Jesus, that he might sanctify the people by his own blood, suffered without the gate" of the temple and the city. The weighty sentiment, then, which the apostle urges, is, that of the benefits accruing from this true, spiritual, and efficacious sacrifice, those cannot partake who adhered to the now abrogated and empty sacrifices of the Jewish temple, in rejection of Christianity. Necessarily, therefore, the opposite holds; that all who believe in and obey the Lord Jesus do partake of those benefits, *holy, real, and eternal blessings*, by a right derived from the sacrifice and from Him that offered it.

5. It has also the effect of *purifying* and rendering fit to be presented to the Holy Majesty of heaven, the *persons* of those who rely upon it: that is, the serious consideration of this great truth is made, by the gracious influence of Him who is expressly called the Spirit of Christ, effectual to produce the disposition and the motives to sincere, universal, and persevering obedience, a cordial consecration to God, and a practical devotedness to his service. ii. 10, 11. viii. 6, 10. ix. 14. x. 10, 22. xiii. 12.

6. It confers the privilege and enjoyment of the most favoured *access to God*, by devotional communion in the present state, and by the ineffable felicity of the heavenly world.

"For there takes place, both an abolition of the preceding commandment [*i. e.* body of institutes comprehended under this single term] on account of its weakness and inefficiency (for the law made nothing perfect), and an introduction of a better hope, by which we draw near to God." vii. 18, 19.

"—That we may have strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us; which we have as an anchor of life both sure and stedfast, and entering into the inner part of [the most holy place within] the veil, whither a forerunner is entered on our behalf, Jesus, become a High-Priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedec." vi. 19, 20. The general idea and the intention of this beautiful passage are obvious; but some difficulty attaches to the imagery. The scene is that familiar one in this Epistle, the most holy place in the Jewish sanctuary, considered as the symbol of the immortal state of blessedness in communion with God. Except in the single word *anchor*, there is nothing that approaches to the allusion to a sea-storm, and the means of safety from it; and the metaphor of an anchor entering into the innermost room of a building, or the adytum of a temple, is quite incongruous. Michaelis, who so happily pointed out the allusion to the ancient practice of asylum-stones, could not free himself from the difficulty except by the hazardous resort to conjecture. As he held that the original of this Epistle was written in the vernacular language of the Jews of Palestine, he supposed that the Greek translator either misunderstood the Syro-Chaldaic word before him, or from some other cause wrote ἄγκυρα instead of ἀκρογωνιαῖος or what other word might signify a corner-stone. But there is no necessity for such a violent remedy. Not only is an anchor the well-known metaphor for *refuge*, *protection*, or *means of safety* (whence Hecuba calls her son *the anchor of her house;* Eurip. Hec. 79), but it is very remarkable that Roman writers living in or near the apostolic age used the word to denote a FOUNDATION. "Ancora metaphoricè ponitur pro refugio, præsidio, munimento, et non semel pro fundamento apud Plinium, Apuleium, et Solinum." *Rob. Stephani Thesaur. Ling. Lat.* We also find the phrase ἄγκυραι βίου in a fragment of Sophocles; "Children are to their mother anchors of life." *Brunckii Lexic. Sophocleum,* voc. Ἄγκυραι. This has suggested to me the translation above ventured upon, of the text under consideration; for I hardly need to remind a student of the New Testament that ψυχὴ is used for *life,* in almost innumerable instances. To complete these materials, we have a passage adduced by Wetstein from the Scholiast on Ælius Aristides, in which he says that the proverb, *The sacred anchor,* "refers to the refuge which existed at sacred places, and which was a security to those who fled to them." Σημαίνει τὴν εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ γινομένην καταφυγὴν, ἥτις ἀσφάλεια τοῖς εἰς αὐτὰ καταφεύγουσιν. *Aristid. ed. Jebb,* vol. ii. p. 194.

Supported by these evidences, I think that we may safely regard the following as a strictly just metaphrase of the difficult clause:

"—Which hope we hold fast as the foundation of life [the life of the soul, its salvation and eternal happiness], both safe and firm, and going [in consequence of its position in the wall of the temple] into the very interior of the most holy place [where is the peculiar presence of God]."

Now let the reader consider that he is not to form his idea of the *corner-stone,* repeatedly alluded to in the Scriptures, from the science of modern or of classical architecture, but from the practice of building in remote and ruder ages. Let him imagine a massive stone, like one of those at Stonehenge or Abury, laid in the building so that its two sides forming the right angle should lie along the two walls; thus binding them together in such a way that neither weather nor force could dissever them. The term ראֹשׁ פִּנָּה (Ps. cxviii. 22), does not necessarily signify that it would be put at the top of the building: it only necessitates the idea of a very important position, which would be strictly predicable if it lay a few courses above the lowest, so as to act by its weight on those below, and to serve as a renewed basis to those above.

These preliminaries being understood, I shall quote some passages from the sagacious author to whom I have often referred, and to whom (with every caution against his occasional precipitancy, and very censurable levity) I own myself greatly indebted.

Ps. cxviii. 22. "*The stone which the builders have thrown away, is made to be the* CORNER-STONE. I understand this literally. It appears that, probably at the building of Solomon's temple, one of those stones which David had taken care to get provided and made ready for use, was found fault with by the builders and declared to be useless; and that God, for altogether different reasons, commanded by a prophet that this stone should be made the corner-stone. The orientals regard the corner-stone as the one peculiarly holy stone in a temple, and that it confers sanctity upon the whole edifice. It is therefore the more probable that, either by the Urim and Thummim (the sacred lot of the Jews), or by a prophet, God was consulted, which stone he would direct to be taken for the corner-stone. The answer was, that which they have perseveringly rejected and declared to be quite unserviceable. Certainly it must have been for a very important reason, that God positively appointed this stone to be the corner-stone. But the New Testament discloses it to us, in Matt. xxi. 42, and 1 Pet. ii. 7. The Jewish nation would conduct themselves towards the Messiah precisely as the builders did towards this stone, and would reject him: but God would select him to be the corner-stone, which would support and sanctify the whole church." *Michaelis, Uebersetz. u. Anmerk.*

Is. viii. 14. "*For he will be a holy-stone for refuge, and a stone for stumbling over and falling to both the nations of Israel.*—'Holy-stone,' literally a *sanctuary:* but under this expression, denoting an object over which persons may stumble and fall, a temple cannot be understood. The following connexion shows that a *holy-stone* is intended. Such sacred stones were very frequent among the eastern nations of antiquity. Jacob, for instance, erected one: Gen. xxviii. 18. These holy or consecrated stones were also usually employed for *the corner-stones of temples.* Sanctuaries, or holy places, temples, altars, and holy stones, possessed the right of an *inviolable asylum,* and persons fled to them, even in war, for security from being put to death. In this passage God is represented as a holy-stone, to which those who trust in him flee, and through whom they are safe: but he who desponds and puts not his confidence in God, is compared to a person who, full of terror, runs blindly forwards, sees not the stone that lies in his way, falls over it, and is severely hurt." Note of the same valuable work, a *German Translation of the Bible, with Annotations for the Unlearned,* in twenty small quarto volumes, Gottingen, 1770, to 1792: "a work by which the most learned may profit," says the late Bishop Middleton, in his *Doctrine of the Greek Article,* p. 452. The author died on August 22, 1791, at the age of seventy-four. By the application of this fact concerning the ancient consecrated stones, he also explains Is. xxviii. 16.

To bring these circumstances to bear upon our present passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is not difficult; nor is it necessary to extract more from the distinguished scholar in whose steps I am treading. It is not an extravagant conjecture, that there actually was such a consecrated corner-stone in the walls of the then existing temple at Jerusalem, one part of which might be seen and touched in the sanctuary, while the other part was in the most holy place, within the veil. But the supposition is by no means necessary; for the sacred writer is treating of the heavenly holy of holies, and the approach of believers to it in the faith and devout affections of their minds; and no author or reader expects that metaphors and imagery, employed for elucidation and impression, should have at the very time an external and literal existence. The sentiments may, I conceive, be truly represented thus: "As a trembling fugitive, fleeing from the drawn sword of pursuing vengeance, gains the temple, flies through its outer court, rushes into the sanctuary, clings to the corner-stone of which he knows that the part unseen is within the veil, and is therefore present where no enemy or avenger dares to enter, and thus feels safe and happy; so the true believer receives the promise of salvation, and the oath declaring the Saviour's everlasting priesthood; he flees to the inviolable asylum of that Saviour's sacrifice, whose efficacy reaches to the very mercy-seat, and connects the faith of the Christian on earth, with the glory of God's peculiar presence in the spiritual world,—he exults in the unalterable veracity of his covenant-Father,—he pours out his soul in grateful praise and humble prayer, -and he enjoys the purest and the most solid comfort, under all his exposure to dangers, sorrows, and temptations.

"We have not a high-priest who cannot sympathize with our weaknesses, but one who has been tempted in all respects like to us, only without sin. Let us then approach with confidence to the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy and may find grace for the most pressing time of need." iv. 15, 16. This beautiful and consoling passage needs no comment.

"Having therefore, brethren, liberty for the way of admission into the most holy place, by the blood of Jesus, a way of admission which he hath opened for us, a fresh and living way, through the veil, that is, his own flesh; and [having also him as] a great Priest over the household of God; let us approach [the throne of the Most High] with a true heart,—" etc. x. 19–22. The εἴσοδος, *entrance*, *way of admission*, evidently relates to the thoughts, affections, and devotions of Christians, by which they have all that intercourse of the mind with God which is compatible with a state in which the capacities of the soul are confined by its union to an earthly body. This access Jesus (ἐνεκαίνισεν) has prepared, opened, consecrated as a new house or temple was dedicated. It is (πρόσφατος) "fresh," belonging to the new covenant, newly proclaimed by the doctrine of Christianity: see the adverb in Acts xviii. 2. These are the only places in the New Testament; but the instances in the LXX. are very illustrative: "*fresh* grapes," Num. vi. 3; "gods that have come up new and *fresh*," Deut. xxxii. 17; and so in Ps. lxxx. (lxxxi. Heb.) 9; "nothing *new* under the sun," Eccl. i. 9; "forsake not an old friend, for the *fresh* one is not equal to him," Wisd. of Jes. ix. 10. It is a "living way;" life is found upon it, in contradistinction from the approach to the symbolical Divine Presence in the Israelitish sanctuary, which was permitted, under pain of death, to none but the high-priest, and to him only once a year: see Lev. xvi. 2. The dying of "the flesh," *the human body* of the Lord Jesus, is poetically compared to a rupturing of the veil in the temple, thus laying open the innermost part of the sanctuary, the most holy place. In another form of expression, this privilege comes to us "by the blood of Jesus." Plainly, then, the chief sentiment and object of this picturesque and striking passage, is to urge the devout and grateful use of our glorious privilege, drawing near to the Majesty of God, in holy exercises of mind; and to impress upon us that this unutterably valuable blessing is conferred only in consequence of the *blood and dying* of the Lord Jesus; which is evidently equivalent to saying, in virtue, or by the excellency and power, of his sacrifice.

7. Of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ it is another effect, that heavenly blessedness will receive his faithful people, without being thereby contaminated and degraded. This is a bold and striking idea: admirably calculated to affect our minds with a most awful sense of the intrinsic, intractable, insufferable, incurable baseness and vileness which belongs to sin. It represents us as defiling every thing that we touch, polluting our very mercies, and turning every thing away from its right use and enjoyment. The state of blessedness would recoil from our approach. But such is the sovereign efficacy of the blood of Christ, that it *guarantees heaven from being dishonoured* by an unsuitable intrusion. This fact was represented in the Hebrew ceremonial, by the institution, that all the parts and utensils of the sanctuary were to be purified by the application of sacrificial blood, both before and after they were brought into actual contact and employ by either the

priests or the people. See Lev. viii. 15, 23, 24. xvi. 16, 18, 19.

"It was therefore necessary, that, as the resemblances of those things [which constitute the state of perfection] in heaven were to be purified by these [inferior victims], so those heavenly things themselves, by sacrifices superior to these: for Christ hath entered, not into the sanctuary made by [human] hands, which was only a representation of the true [sanctuary], but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf." ix. 23, 24. The meaning of this passage is sufficiently plain: and it receives confirmation from the succeeding verses, which have been before commented upon. The plural form, "superior sacrifices," appears to be used as a declaration of the general truth, that, though, for a temporal and ceremonial cleansing, animal purifications had served; yet, for a real, spiritual, holy, and eternal effect, sacrifices of intrinsic worth and transcendent excellence would be necessary. The sequel points out the application of this general proposition to the particular case before us. By the sole and efficacious sacrifice of our Immortal High-Priest, who "offered up Himself;" believers are made fit for heaven, and heaven is made ready for them.

In all these aspects does the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews present the reasons, relations, and effects of the office which Christ sustains as the High-Priest of his church.

To what an extent has this survey carried us! Yet it is but a mere sketch, and, in respect of most of the particulars, it has been concise and abrupt. We have found our Lord and Redeemer described as the Priest, the Great Priest, the High-Priest,—Sole,—Supreme;—divinely appointed in a manner consonant with his unrivalled dignity;—standing in an assumed relation to mankind, for the purpose of making a sacrificial and consecrating offering :—submitting to the most bitter sorrows, agonies, and death ;—effecting a real propitiation and expiation for the sinful state of mankind, in all the senses and respects which are suitable to the immutability of the divine perfections, and the glorious honour of the divine government :—rich in power and grandeur, and equally so in compassion and tenderness ;—absolute for all the purposes of salvation ;—possessed of all moral perfection ;—exalted above the highest of created natures ;—taking as his own, and occupying as his indisputable right, a station of glory and dignity which only Deity could assume ;—reigning with an invincible dominion over all created beings, to the happiness and joy of the holy, and to the restraint and just punishment of the rebellious ;—and bestowing on sinful and undeserving men the greatest blessings, not shadowy and figurative, but real, substantial, enduring, and boundless ; the pardon of sin, the favour of God, conformity to the holiness of the Divine Nature, and everlasting blessedness. Other august and instructive titles are also given to our Lord Jesus Christ in relation to his priesthood. He is held forth to us as the *Messenger* sent by the Eternal and most Merciful Father, and fulfilling the great moral design of the Levitical institution ;—the *Minister* of the most holy place, presiding over the universal worship of his people, and rendering it acceptable to the throne of perfect purity ;—the *Lord* who spake by the prophets, and now by his apostles, concerning the great salvation acquired by his sufferings ;—the *Sanctifier*, who by his blood consecrates and presents to God all his true followers ;—the *Brother* of those for whom he came to die, and whom he condescends, as the act of a superior nature, to nominate into this endearing relation to himself ;

—the *Surety*, a pledge of salvation from God to man, and of obedience from man to God;—the *Mediator*, transacting the most important concerns between the Righteous Ruler of the world and his revolted subjects, in order to their reconciliation and restoration, and accomplishing this great work by means of his sacrificial blood;—the *Princely Author* of life, faith, and salvation, achieving his great purpose by his sufferings and death;—a *Saviour* to the uttermost, because he offered up himself and hath an unchangeable priesthood;—an *Intercessor* and *Advocate*, faithfully and powerfully maintaining our infinite interests, upon the ground and reason of the propitiation by his blood;—the *Forerunner*, securing to his followers the heavenly inheritance, by virtue of his priestly oblation;—the *Great Shepherd*, conferring the blessings of the everlasting covenant, through the efficacy of his blood;—the SON OF GOD, partaking the flesh and blood of the children of Adam, that through his own death he might accomplish their redemption; and to depreciate whose blood is the most dreadful of offences.

Such being the declarations concerning the personal character of our Divine High-Priest, and his qualities in the discharge of his office; we have collected from the same source, additional illustrations of the OFFICE itself, and its necessary adjuncts. It stands *alone* and *unrivalled;*—it is *perfect*, for all the purposes of divine mercy and wisdom;—it is a *real* priesthood, all others being but emblems and representations of it;—it contained the essential quality of a priesthood, the offering of an *immolated sacrifice;*—this sacrifice is efficacious by a continual *presentation* in the heavenly world;—and it produces the most happy EFFECTS, the *ratification* of the promulgated covenant of grace,—Christ's mediatorial right of conferring infinite blessings;—the *recon-*

ciliation of sinners to their justly offended Sovereign;—*entitling* to the full benefits and enjoyments of the great salvation;—it is the great instrument, by the efficient grace of the Holy Spirit, in *producing personal holiness;*—by it Christians have the most favoured *access* to the throne of grace;—in a word (and could a more touching representation be presented to a creature's mind, of the majesty of eternal holiness, and the efficacy of the great sacrifice?—) it *guards the purity of heaven* from being dishonoured by the admission of those who, without the purifying blood, would have been odious and disgusting.

Should any object, that these views have been deduced only from the Epistle to the Hebrews, and that their force is abated or nullified by doubts of its canonical authority,[1] I offer two replies.

1. Let them seriously study it, in its simple text, with close attention and fervent prayer. Let them ask, whether it is possible, without violating the most satisfactory rules of literary criticism and common sense, to affirm that it could be written at any other period than about the latter years of the life of Paul. Let them fairly consider, whether the personal allusions at the end can be referred to any other writer. And let them give an impartial attention to the arguments of Professor Stuart and of Mr Forster, upon this investigation. In particular, the *anatomising of the diction*, performed in so searching a manner by both those critics, seems to me sufficient to satisfy the most sceptical that this Epistle is a genuine work of the Apostle Paul.[2]

---

[1] This objection has been made by Mr Belsham and others.

[2] See the *Commentary on the Ep. to the Hebrews; by Prof. Moses Stuart*, second ed. Andover, Massachusetts; 1833; and *The Apostolical Authority of the Ep. to the Hebrews: an Inquiry in which the Received Title of the Greek Epistle is vindicated against the cavils of objectors ancient and modern, from*

2. I earnestly solicit their attention to the passages quoted, and arguments constructed, in the preceding Discourse on the Sacrifice of Christ, from other parts of Holy Scripture. It is true that, in no other part of the New Testament, is Christ actually styled a Priest: and this indeed supplies some reason for the assertion that, without the Epistle to the Hebrews, there would have been a serious defect in the completeness of the New Testament as an explication and completion of the Old, and particularly as a development of the motives and objects of numerous parts of the Patriarchal and Mosaic institutions, which can be referred to no satisfactory ground of utility, civil or religious, if their symbolical character be relinquished. But it is also true that in so many other passages Jesus Christ is represented as laying down his life for his people, giving himself for them, and being a sacrifice in so doing, that the idea of his acting as the Priest who presents his own sacrifice is plainly included. He himself affirmed that Psalm to refer to the Messiah, in which he is declared by the Eternal Father, to be a Priest for ever. And, finally, there was a very obvious and weighty reason for reserving this application of the Levitical terms and offices, till so near the catastrophe of the Jewish nation, that the danger would be past of its being made an article of accusation against the Christians of Judea.

From the preceding investigation, it appears very evident that they are greatly mistaken, who represent the Priestly Dignity of our Blessed Saviour as only an accommodated and figurative mode of expression,

---

Origen to Sir J. D. Michaelis, chiefly upon Grounds of Internal Evidence hitherto unnoticed; comprising a Comparative Analysis of the Style and Structure of this Epistle, and of the Undisputed Epistles of St Paul, tending to throw light upon their Interpretation: by the Rev. Charles Forster, B.D., etc. etc.—London, 1838. And see Supplementary Note XXIV.

useful at the time for conciliating some of the Jews, but now needless and obsolete. Indeed the supposition itself, which is the basis of this theory, is really unreasonable and self-destructive. The design was to answer the objection of a Jew against Christianity, that it had none of the privileges and impressive grandeur of the old law, and that it swept away acknowledged divine institutions, without assigning a good reason or substituting anything better in their stead. This objection the writer of the Epistle professes to remove, by denying its assumption, and saying that no real privilege or blessing of the former dispensation was lost; that Christianity truly had its sanctuary, its sacrifice, and its High-Priest; that these were infinitely more glorious than the correspondent objects under the law; that those were only shadows and emblems, while these were the *reality* of the things declared, the substantial, immortal, soul-beatifying good. Yet, after all, upon the hypothesis, these high and splendid representations are made without truth and solidity; they are the play of fancy; they are an ingenious management to humour and please certain predilections; they were invented merely to elude the objection, while the writer knew that they were no honest answer to it. Was such a way of argumentation likely to answer the purpose intended? Would it not, much more certainly and effectually, revolt an ingenuous mind, and confirm in, not simply a rejection, but a contempt of the religion of Jesus? Would not a conscientious Jew have viewed with horror the assertion that "the Holy Spirit signified" (ix. 8) such a meaning by the most important of the Levitical ceremonies; when this was not indeed the fact, when not the least resemblance to such an intention had existed at the prescription of that part of the Mosaic ritual; when, to confess the truth, it was nothing more than a happy thought of the present writer, to answer a temporary conveniency?

Again, I would ask, can any serious and devotional person (for a light and profane scorner, or a flippant presumer, should apply to other lessons before he sets up himself to judge on questions like this) read the Epistle, particularly the part here chiefly to be regarded, mark and sympathise with its holy fervour, its sublime piety, its deep and constant feeling of God, judgment, and eternity,—and believe that the argument so positively averred, so triumphantly concluded, so awfully urged, is a creature of the writer's imagination, a tissue of artifice, a mystification?—Indeed, I cannot but fear that the persons themselves, who have invented this all-convenient hypothesis of accommodation, have so formed the habit of using popular language with ambiguous meanings, in order to maintain their own credit and not to shock the multitude, that they have no moral delicacy in such matters. They therefore are likely to feel less scruple in imputing to the original teachers of Christianity the course in which they themselves scruple not to walk. Some of these writers even make it a duty to refrain from the public refutation of popular evangelical opinions, because it would be a barbarous, impious, and cruel invasion of the peace and comfort of our fellow-Christians; a peace and comfort which, if we were once thus to break up, we could never restore. (*Heinrichs in Ep. ad Heb.* p. 250. See also his *Excursus V.* on the Acts.) Surely the serious fact implied in this concession ought to awaken a suspicion in the minds of those learned persons, that *the truth* of the subjects lies not on their side; and that, while they profess themselves to be so loftily wise, they are really becoming fools. Well would it be for them if they would receive a caution from their distinguished countryman whom I have so often quoted, in his Version and Annotation on Psalm cxix. 118. "*Thou separatest all slacks* [furnace-refuse] *from thy law, for their deceit is falsehood.* By *slacks* in this passage is meant that which is unsound, the ordinances of men, set in opposition to the commandments of God; or false explanations of it: these God regards as worthless, and throws them away. The latter clause is equivalent to saying, The new interpretations and artful additions, which they endeavour to annex to thy law, are nothing but deception." *Michaelis.*

And, after all, what do they gain, if they sincerely believe Christianity to be, in its principle and in its fundamental doctrines, a revelation of truth and mercy from God? A professed and adroit defender of the falsely styled *rationalist* system assures us that "the accommodation-plan alters not the essence of a doctrine, but merely procures for it a more advantageous admission into the understanding and the heart." (The German translator of the late Rev. *Hugh James Rose's Discourses on the State of the Protestant Religion in Germany;* p. 65. Leipzig, 1826.) Then *the facts* remain the same, whatever becomes of their external form and the fashion of their clothing; God is a holy Lawgiver, man an inexcusable sinner, Christ an Almighty and Righteous Saviour; salvation is effected only by his obedience and sufferings; heaven is a holy world, and divine influence is necessary to prepare man for it; sin is the supreme evil, and leads to irretrievable misery. And, if these be the facts of the case, if such be the state of things for the human race and for eternity, only let the *rational consequences* be acknowledged; and we shall be satisfied. But, alas! little reason have we to look for the realizing of this hope. The tendency and objects of the Neological system indicate too plainly what its motives are. They are put in so fair a light by the elder Dr Tittmann, that I believe the citation will not appear too long to any serious and intelligent reader.

"What, in fine, do our modern scholars imagine themselves to have gained by this *historical interpretation* of theirs? It lies in the following particulars, which I will state in their own words: that the positions of religious doctrine, delivered by Jesus and his apostles, whether referring to faith or to practice, are merely historical, or that their importance and authority consist solely in their being materials for narrative, but in no respect attaching to matters of sentiment; in other words, that they contain the opinions which Jesus and the apostles entertained, but not absolute and eternal truth; fugitive reasonings and temporary institutions, belonging to the men of those times, and to them probably beneficial, but not necessary determinations of what is in its own nature right or wrong;—that these declarations were not immutable, of universal interest and importance to salvation, for all men of all ages; that they were a temporary rule of believing and acting, not constant, sure, and intended for mankind in all future times; that whatever therefore is elicited from the primitive documents of the Christian religion, by historical interpretation, is only matter of historical utility; —that the whole body of Christian doctrine itself is only historical, that is, we may learn from it merely what Jesus and what the apostles maintained, believed, and taught to the men of their age, and what they wished to have known and believed by them: but not what ought to be known and believed by all men without exception;—that Jesus himself did not promulgate, nor ever intended, nor ever was able, to promulgate, a system of doctrine which should be a binding rule of faith and conduct, which should have power and authority through all ages, which should be the way of salvation for all men of all future times, which should be necessary to be received with a cordial faith by all who desire eternal salvation;—that it was indeed the purpose of divine providence to promulgate by Jesus Christ a few principal truths, as necessary to be known and believed universally, but that Christ was not himself aware of this;—that much less did the apostles know or understand any religious doctrines as certain truths, or did, or could teach them as certain truths, or ever imagined that the doctrine which they delivered was a perpetual rule of faith and practice;—that they had their heads full of wild expectations about the end of the world as near at hand, the second coming of Christ as soon to take place, an earthly reign to be entered upon at his coming, and other things of that kind;—that Jesus therefore, in delivering his instructions, did not and could not have any reference to the inhabitants of the world in future ages;—that his whole system belonged only to the persons of his own time and country, the Jews alone;—that he accommodated himself to the opinions of the Jews, opinions resting upon no solid foundation of truth, that according to these opinions he spake and taught, that according to these we must interpret his declarations, but that, whether they were true and deserving of approbation and belief, we are to judge for ourselves;—that, in fact, what Jesus taught was not always true, not always to be relied upon;—that consequently the system of doctrine which he delivered was not a divine revelation, as we are accustomed to call it:—that it was nothing but a body of Jewish moral philosophy; that the origin of the knowledge and doctrine of Jesus is a matter of historical investigation; that is, it must be derived from studying the opinions and decisions of the Jewish rabbies and other superior men of that time, from whose tuition or conversation, aided by his own talents and industry, he derived all his wisdom;—that he was ignorant on many subjects, that he was often in error, and taught error, both to the people at large, and to his own disciples, and that he allowed these errors to be diffused among the body of Christians;—that yet these very errors in Jesus and his apostles were overruled by divine wisdom, so as to be beneficial at the time;—that, however, some of the doctrines delivered by Jesus and the apostles were true, and are of course to be maintained as true, yet not because they were taught by them and are contained in the sacred writings, but only because, and so far as, they are found consonant with the dictates of reason;—that all are not true and sure and necessary doctrines of religion, which are found in these books, and are commonly reputed to be therefore true and sure and necessary;—that many are uncertain, needless, and merely temporary opinions and institutions;—that the sacred books have no claim whatever to be regarded as of divine origin and authority;—that by historical interpretation we have both the right and ability to determine, whether the doctrine therein taught can and should be regarded as divine, and worthy of a divinely commissioned teacher;—that whatever is not admitted by historical interpretation to be a divine doctrine, is not to be so esteemed;—that it is not to be admitted that the sacred writers could not err, and did not in fact err; but that the reverse was the case;—that the sacred books in general, and particularly, the narratives of the Evangelists, are of doubtful origin and authority.

"Such are the fancied discoveries of historical interpretation! What then is Jesus to us; what his work, what his merit for the salvation of man; if he were not a teacher of divine and eternal truth, deserving of our fullest confidence, and sent from God? Why should we inquire into the doctrine of Christ; if he had it not from God, but learned it from the doctors of his age, or hammered it out of his own inventive mind, and intended it for his countrymen merely? What need we care about his coming upon earth, his death, his resurrection, his ascension to heaven, his sitting at the right hand of the Father,—facts on which we rest all our hope of eternal salvation; if his teaching and that of his apostles be worthy of no credit? What becomes of the plan of salvation by faith in Christ, in which the apostles taught that all ages to come should behold and admire the boundless grace of God, his love to man, his unutterable wisdom; if the doctrines and precepts and institutions of Jesus were temporary and transitory things? What avail the miracles of Jesus, to which he so often appealed as indubitable evidences of his divine mission; if, after the insane folly of Woolston, they are to be tortured into allegories; or, which is still worse, to be put down among the effects of natural causes, by which Jesus deceived, or at least allowed to be deceived, the ignorant vulgar? What value belongs to the Gospel History, which we regard as the basis of faith and piety; if it contain fictions and silly fables? Of what use are the Holy Scriptures, which the pupils of gospel truth universally receive as the only and decisive and infallible rule of faith and guide of life; if the sacred writers delivered not the oracles of God, but their own and other people's theorizings? Or, if their declarations are to be esteemed true and divine, not on their own account, and because they have come by divine communication; but solely because human reason chooses to acknowledge them as true and divine? Why should we labour in the interpretation of Scripture, if that interpretation must rest, not upon the fair and grammatical investigation of the words and phrases, but upon presumed opinions concerning the subjects; not on the just use of language and the proper means of acquiring it, but on the decrees of reason, that is, of the philosophy now in vogue? What avail the whole body of practical religion, the serious study of things relating to God, faith and hope in Christ, the entire harmony of Christianity; if the reason and idolized philosophy of man be the sole fountain of divine wisdom, and the supreme judge in matters of religion? What then is the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, more than an obsolete system of philosophy? In fine, if this be not, what is, to deny Jesus the Lord, to assault him with blasphemies, to render his divine mission doubtful, or indeed empty and exploded, to combat his doctrine, basely to disfigure, to wound, to hold up to ridicule, and, if it could be effected, to suppress Christianity altogether, and make it a separate thing from religion, to confine religion within the strait bounds of self-called and domineering reason, to make miracles a laughing-stock, to charge with silly vanity, defame, and torture the Holy Scripture, till it shall be subdued to an entire accommodation to the good pleasure and the sovereign decisions of man's wisdom, to corrupt it by daring conjectures, to drag it into contempt, to crush its divine authority, to weaken, shake, and utterly overthrow the foundations of the Christian faith?

"The end of this career can only be what all history, by abundant evidence, has demonstrated: that, with the undervaluing and proscription of the word of God, its sincere grammatical interpretation, and the liberal erudition of languages, all religious principles will be despised, adulterated with the foulest corruptions, entirely overthrown, and reduced either to a vapid name of Natural Religion, or to a chaos of mysticism, than which nothing is more pernicious to Christian doctrine, or to a paltry system of mythic fables, or to a crude mass of poetical fancies, wrapped up in figures and fictions. To this last notion not a few divines and preachers of our day seem to have a strong inclination; as, in delivering their religious teachings they seem wonderfully delighted with the gliding shades of tropes and figures, sensible images, and plays of fancy, such as formerly were characteristic of the tribe of mystics and fanatics, and by which, while they are toiling to soften down the doctrines of faith, and make them more agreeable to human reason, they miserably deceive both others and themselves. And, finally, the result must be, that gross ignorance of all divine truths, rude barbarism, and their inseparable companions, degrading superstition, dreams of wild fancy, monsters of opinion, and every kind of vice and wickedness, will burst in with irresistible force upon the Christian church, and spread far and wide their baneful dominion! *We shall lose the Gospel*, the Reformers used to say, and with the fullest reason, *We shall lose the Gospel*, *if we lose learning!* And so must we forebode, if we lose the interpretation of Scripture, by the fair and impartial methods of grammatical study." *Meletemata Sacra*, *præf.* p. xxi.–xxvii. Leipzig, 1816.[1]

---

[1] This excellent writer, Dr Charles Christian Tittmann, Lutheran Pastor and Superintendent at Dresden, died Dec. 6, 1820, aged 76. His principal works are, *Tractatus de Vestigiis Gnosticorum in Novo Test. frustra quæsitis*; 1773. *Opuscula Theologica*, containing fifteen very valuable dissertations; 1803. *Meletemata Sacra*, a Commentary on the Gospel of John; 1816. His son, Dr John Augustus Henry Tittmann, late Prof. of Divinity at Leipzig, died, Dec. 30, 1831, at the age of 58. His talents as a philologist and a critic, surpassed even those of his father. His writings, both in Latin and in German, are individually of small size, but of rich value. His *Synonyms of the New Test.* (*De Synonymis N. T.* lib. i. Leipzig, 1829; lib. ii. 1832), left unfinished, has

I cordially wish that the Unitarians of this country would seriously consider, whether they are not treading in a path, whose character and tendency coincides with that against which the German Professor thus raised his faithful protest. There are symptoms, in no small degree alarming, adverse to this desire and discouraging to our hopes. Books have been published in our country with appearances of having flowed out of the fountain to which I have alluded; books boasting of pure ideal Christianity, and of Christian Theism, and pretending to assign an origin to Christianity which, perhaps a little disguised, turns out to be merely human. The tendency, indeed the avowal, is to a system of revived Pantheism,—Atheism, in almost its horrid nakedness, for the thin veil is only an insult to the understandings of men:—the system of Hegel and

---

been translated by the Rev. Edw. Craig, and published in the Edinburgh Biblical Cabinet, 1833 and 1837; as also some other of his Dissertations. A collection of his Prolusions and other minor Treatises was published after his death, by Dr Hahn of Leipzig; in number twenty-two, upon interesting subjects of sacred philology, literary and ecclesiastical history, and general theology. (*Opuscula Varii Argumenti.* 1833.) These and the Synonyms can scarcely be too much recommended to theological students. The same learned and truly Christian scholar has likewise carefully re-edited, with an additional Preface, Tittmann's edition of the Greek Testament, which had been twice printed before, but this last by the learned, disinterested, and benevolent publisher, Mr Tauchnitz (1840), is a book both cheap and of extraordinary beauty as to type and paper. Its luminous page speaks through the eye to the mind, and is thus better than many a comment. Of the two former editions, the unpretending appearance and cheapness have probably contributed to prevent their meeting with their merited attention in our country. The Preface is a fine specimen of criticism, conducted in the spirit of wisdom and cautious judgment; and the Text is constituted in the same spirit, and does not deviate from the commonly received nearly so much as does Griesbach. Dr Jaumann, a learned Roman Catholic, who published a critical edition of the Greek Testament at Neuburg in 1835, speaks in very respectful terms of Griesbach's and others', but gives the palm to this of Tittmann.

Prof. Moses Stuart says, "A somewhat familiar acquaintance with the writings of Professor Tittmann has brought me to regard him as one of the most able, sober, and impartial critics on the language of the New Testament that Germany has of late produced. He has left nothing behind him which I have seen, that will not abundantly repay perusal, and even study; which is more than can be truly said of most writers, in any age or country."—*American Biblical Repos.* Jan. 1835, p. 84.

Strauss. The short expression of this folly is, that there is no personal, intellectual, presiding God, but that God is the universe and the universe is God, that the individual man has no conscious existence after death; but that the human nature subsists on an infinite succession of individuals, the particular men indeed dying, but the race ever renewed and therefore possessing the properties of an antecedent eternity and all infinite and finite attributes; "God become man, the infinite renouncing itself to finiteness, and the finite spirit reminding itself of its own infinity: it is the child of the visible mother and the invisible father, of spirit and nature:—it is the worker of miracles;—it is sinless;—it is the dying, the rising, and the heaven-ascending.—Through faith in this Christ, namely in his death and his resurrection, man becomes righteous before God: that is, through the animation of the idea of humanity in itself, namely in the proportion of the power of the negation of naturalness and sensitiveness, which itself is already the negation of the spirit: thus the negation of the negation is the only way for man to the true spiritual life, [and thus] also the individual becomes a partaker of the God-man life of the [whole] kind. This alone is the complete substance of the doctrine concerning Christ." The introductory clause to this passage is, "This the key to the whole doctrine concerning Christ." *Strauss*, *Leben Jesu*, vol. ii. p. 767–8; Tübingen, 1839. Also quoted, and commented upon, and REFUTED by Dr Mill's (Christian Advocate) *Observations on the Pantheistic Principles, etc.* Part I. Cambridge, 1840.

—And there are *men* (?) who call this mad wickedness, their transcendental philosophy!!—For this they can renounce "the glorious gospel of the BLESSED GOD;"—Did ever upon earth, the words receive a more perfect verification, — "professing themselves to be wise, they have become *fools?*"

It is proper to add, that there are, among the modern divines on the continent, some of a very different character from that of the Neologists; yet who have accustomed themselves to say that Christ is not properly, but only figuratively, a priest and a king. But with them it is merely a question of words. They simply mean that Christ was not a Levitical priest, serving in the temple at Jerusalem; just as he was not a king of an earthly sovereignty, having the visible insignia and attendants of temporal royalty. In reality, they do not appear to hold anything different, on this point, from what we regard as scriptural truth. Yet let me be allowed to repeat, that the propriety of language would be more consulted, were we to affirm that the Lord Jesus is the ONLY *proper* priest that ever was or ever will be; and that all others, to whom that name has been legitimately given, were only shadows and pictures of him.

DISCOURSE III.

ON THE ATONEMENT MADE BY CHRIST.

The view of the work of Christ as a Saviour which comes under the notion of Expiation, Propitiation, or Atonement, has been adverted to in the two preceding Discourses, as immediately arising from the idea of a Sacrifice; but I conceive that advantage will be gained to the cause of truth, by a more detailed exposition of the principles upon which this mode of representation rests, as they may be deduced by plain reasoning upon the necessary circumstances of accountable creatures.

I. That the Author and Lord of the universe exercises a perfect *Moral Government*, consisting in the duly apportioned manifestations of his approbation and disapprobation, over rational creatures, is capable of being demonstrated to any impartial mind, with abundant evidence, from different sources of argument; such, for example, as the necessary perfections of the Deity; the analogy of his physical government, in which order and law are so wonderfully observed; incipient strivings, as it were, and breakings forth of moral retributions in the present state; the feelings and expectations of men on their own behalf; their conduct towards each other; and that instinctive sense of moral differences, in dispositions and actions, which is invincible and indelible in every human mind.

II. The sum of all that man can obtain of satisfactory knowledge concerning the principles and rules of God's moral government, which hold the same rank in the intellectual system that the laws of matter and motion do in the physical, constitutes *the Moral Law.*

III. The whole spirit and requirements of the Moral Law lie in the single idea of *Justice;* that is, rendering to every being that which, in right, he ought to have.

From this one source might be deduced, by a process of plain and undeniable reasoning, all the requirements and prohibitions of the Moral Law. Consequently it is the same as the *Law of Nature*, or the collection of moral principles which men in general, without any positive revelation, have the power and opportunity of inferring from their own feelings, wants, and wishes, acted upon by the occurrences of individual experience and social life. "For, since the Gentiles who have not a [written] law, by nature [φύσει, instinct, disposition, or moral sentiment], do [τὰ τοῦ νόμου] the things directed or prohibited by the law, they, though they have not a law [in a written and external form], are to themselves a law; who [therefore thus] manifest the law's operation [ἔργον, business or purport], written in their own hearts, their consciences always bearing a testimony, and their inward reasonings on both sides either accusing or pleading for them." Rom. ii. 14, 15. Upon these grounds it is that the apostle affirms the heathen, even with all the refinements of their philosophy, to have been "inexcusable" in their abandonment of the true God, their idolatry, and their other wicked practices; because "that which can be known [τὸ γνωστὸν] concerning God is manifest in them, for God hath [so] manifested it to them;—they know God,—they perceive [ἐπιγνόντες] the righteous judgment of God." Ch. i. 20, 19, 21, 32.

The Ten Commandments comprise the great principles of the Moral Law, expressed in the concrete form of application to one particular species under each genus;[1] and with a small addition of positive precept, namely in the case of a specified time for religious celebrations. This, therefore, might be mutable and temporary; while all the rest, being moral, must, in its own nature, be of immutable and eternal obligation.

When our Lord reduces these precepts, and every moral injunction delivered by "the law and the prophets," to *two;* and the apostle still further contracts them into *one;* the dispersed forms are merely brought back to the general principle, which is LOVE, or feeling and wishing kindly to the objects with whom we have connexion, or of whom we have knowledge. But this is only a case of *justice.* We feel and wish kindly to ourselves, and *we irresistibly take up a sense of disapprobation, condemnation, and repugnance* towards a fellow-creature who shows himself to feel and wish unkindly towards us; we conceive that he does us wrong, that he commits a violation of justice against us, that he is on that account blameworthy, and that consequently *he deserves* some *mark of righteous disapprobation*, which is the precise definition of *punishment.* If our wish and expectation of moral duty from a fellow-creature towards ourselves be *just*, it is *equally just* that we should feel and act in the same way towards him: and this therefore is one part of the divine law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." The other part rests, with the same irresistible strength of evidence, upon the same principle. Our Blessed Teacher calls it "the first and GREAT commandment:" for in the worth and weight of its binding *reason*, that is, in the estimation of *pure* JUSTICE, it exceeds every possible obligation to any creature, in the proportion that ETERNITY exceeds time, that INFINITY is greater than a limited existence, that DEITY transcends a frail creature or the universe of creatures. The *claims* of GOD to the entire affections of every rational being, rest upon *his merits*. Those merits are the compound result of his infinite *perfections* and of *the exercise* of some of those perfections in the benevolent creation and preservation of dependent nature. Therefore the merits and the claims are *necessarily* INFINITE, and "the great commandment" is nothing but the demand of JUSTICE; "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength."

---

[1] This simple and terse method was evidently the most suitable for the purpose of being the basis of the Israelitish constitution, since a national legislation can hold its subjects amenable for only overt acts. But the goodness of God was conspicuous in making the last of the commandments refer to *a state of mind*, thus furnishing a direction and an excitement to such serious reflection, as would not fail to bring out the *constructive* interpretation leading to the widest extent of practical religion and theological science. This all-important impression was likely to be aided by the distinguishing circumstance that the "Ten Words" [דְּבָרִים Deut. x. 4] were uttered by a miraculous voice, issuing out of the thick darkness which covered the summit of Sinai, so that it was distinctly heard by the whole million and half of people. Thus a provision was made for the cultivation of religious knowledge and practice as we find them developed in the Psalms and other O. T. Books; thus a foundation was laid for the conviction of sin and a longing for redemption (Rom. vii. 7–25); and thus "the law became our schoolmaster [to lead us] to Christ."

IV. The requirements of the Moral Law, to the fullest extent that is deducible by reasoning or made known by revelation, are not the dictates of the mere or sovereign *will* of the Deity, but are the results of the real nature of things and the propriety of relations.

For, if the moral rule enjoined by God to direct the practice of rational creatures, were the result of mere will, or an option of indifference, then it might have been made otherwise from what it now is; it might even have been opposite to that which is actually constituted. Injustice, therefore, would have been justice, and justice injustice; hatred, envy, and ingratitude would have been commendable; and benevolence, generosity, and a thankful feeling towards those who are kind to us, would have been blameable, disapproved by God, and deserving of punishment;—if omnipotent will had been pleased so to ordain. Should any man affirm that this is not a sufficient reducing to the absurd and impossible, I should be obliged to decline any further arguing with him.

We may reason in another way. The will, which determined the present constitution of moral obligations, acted either from motive or not, with reason or without reason. If the former, then *the motive or reason* which led to the result was *that ground of propriety* for which we plead; if the latter, the supposition is plainly absurd.

If then the Moral Law be the result of the real nature of moral things, there must be an original and necessary difference in that nature, and the actual *reason* of the Moral Law must have been an intrinsic goodness, truth, and excellency in the dispositions or actions approved; and an intrinsic vileness, baseness, unreasonableness, and unfitness, in those which are disapproved.

It also follows that this reason of the Moral Law is *eternal* and *unalterable.* It has not sprung out of any arbitrary constitution of things, but out of an impartial consideration of what is right or wrong, originally and of itself, irrespectively of consequences.

Since this reason must be always the same, the obligation of the law which rests upon it must be always the same: that is, it is the necessary and unalterable duty of every rational being to love God with all its powers, and to love its fellow-creatures as itself; or, to *do justice.*

If we attempt to ascend still higher in tracing this *reason* of the Will of God, we arrive at the Total Perfection of the Divine Nature, as the infinitely glorious and absolute, the SUM and ESSENCE of *all good*, the primary and ultimate reason of all that is wise, right, and morally beautiful. Higher we cannot go: and a wish to go higher would be both absurd and impious.

By different teachers and in different forms of expression, the causal principle of moral duty has been represented as consisting in something subjective, internal to a rational creature, and of spontaneous operation. This has been placed in the affections, or susceptibilities of pleasure and pain; and, by other authors, in the faculty of judgment, producing self-approbation or its contrary, and which is the same thing as conscience. This feeling or dictate of judgment, taking place instantaneously upon the mind's perceiving a proposed object, is regarded as an unfailing index, recommending the right and dissuading from the wrong. But it is evident that this inward witness, by whatever name we call it, cannot be an original principle: either it must be evolved from combinations of thought probably or even necessarily occurring, or it must have been infused or in some way communicated from a higher power. Authority of itself it cannot have. The attempt to give it authority, upon the plan of self-development, conducts us to the idolizing and idolized self (*das transcendentale Ich*) of the German philosophers, from Kant to Hegel;[1] and in the other case of the alternative, it introduces us to that Divine Teacher whose "word is a lamp to our feet and a light to our path." That the human being may be "a law to himself," it is evidently necessary both that he have derived sufficient *information* from the proper source, and that he be not under a *depraved bias* of the affections. In both these respects, fallen man, antecedently to divine revelation and acts of grace, is fatally deficient.[1]

---

[1] Whose intellectual character has been severely but I fear truly described, —"that the Germans, as Colonel Napier says, 'plodding even to a proverb, possess the most extravagant imaginations on the face of the earth;' so that it is just as natural for a German system-monger to go wrong, as it is for any other mant o go right." Quart. Rev. July, 1836; vol. lvi. p. 531.

It no less plainly follows that the theory which lays utility, expediency, or self-interest as the foundation of moral obligation, is erroneous. This results by arguing *à priori* upon the simple principles just mentioned: and it is easy to establish the same conclusion *à posteriori*, by tracing the practical operation of the expediency-system. True indeed it is, that conformity to the approving will of God is conducive to individual happiness and to the general good, and must eventually produce the highest degree of both. This is therefore a sound *accessory* reason of moral obligation: our objection lies against the raising it into the primary reason.

Further; this great truth, relative to the supreme reason of moral obligation, shows *the utter impossibility* of (1.) the Socinian hypothesis, which maintains the exercises of divine justice to be optional to the divine will: (2.) the Arminian hypothesis, which supposes the original law of perfection to have been repealed or lowered in its demands, by divine grace; and that a mitigated or remedial law is put in its stead: (3.) the Pseudo-Calvinistic opinion, that unconverted men are under any disability or impotency, which prevents them from complying with the requirements of the divine law, other than that which arises out of the criminal disaffection and voluntary repugnance of their own minds: and (4.) the Antinomian doctrine, that the obligation of the Moral Law is extinguished, with regard to believers in the Gospel. Only admit *the ground* of the Law, as consisting in the highest original REASON, and the reverse of all these schemes will follow by the clearest necessity: the most dreadful degree of wickedness, in the present life or in the life to come, can never relax the smallest ligament in the obligation of the sinful being to love and obey God: and the saints on earth and the perfect spirits in heaven now feel it, and for ever will feel it, their sweetest happiness and highest glory to be UNDER THIS LAW. Thus is demonstrated the grand moral apophthegm so beautifully expressed by the pious and amiable Hooker: "Of LAW there can be no less acknowledged, than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world; all things in heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempted from her power; both angels and men, and creatures of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all, with uniform consent, admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy." *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book I. Sect. 16.

---

[1] This subject is discussed in a penetrating and impartial manner, by Dr Wardlaw, in his *Christian Ethics;* Lect. IV.

V. *Holiness* is the respecting of the *due relations*, or the objects of intended reference which *ought to* be, in the performance of actions.

These due relations are, the infinite worthiness of God as resulting from the glorious attributes of his nature,—the supreme end of honouring him,—and the subordinate ends of advancing the moral perfection of ourselves and others, that is the greatest benefit of the universe, so far as our influence can reach.

In other words, Holiness is a conformity to the moral law.

It has been common to use the term *Virtue* to denote this subjective comprehension of moral rectitude; but *Holiness* is evidently the preferable term, on account of its sacred sanction in the scriptural use, and because it more perfectly and precisely answers the end of expressing the generic idea of moral goodness, including the three species, namely, *Piety*, or devout affections towards God, *Virtue* in the knowledge, government, and employment of ourselves, and *Morality* in the discharge of all obligations which respect our fellow-creatures.

VI. *Sin* is the absence of respect to the due relations of actions. Should any think this a lenient definition, let them consider the following explanation.

Such mere absence leaves the moral agent in the state of vicious defect: and, since the affections (which are either mental actions or the springs of mental actions) cannot remain inert, their activity and other essential properties, which are in themselves a natural good, continue to act, but act under a bias or influence which is unnatural and sinful: they act, therefore, from wrong impulses, in wrong directions, and to wrong objects. So that *the state* of sin, or the being a subject of inhering sinfulness, is both a state of habitual vicious *defect*, and a state of vicious *activity* in those desires, emotions, motives, cherishing of principles, and outward acts, which are contrary to the moral law of nature (which was shown above to be the Law of God), and are therefore contrary to nature, that is, unnatural. The first of these views of the state of sin, is the primary idea of sinfulness, and the most simple that we can form; the second is a derivative and complex idea, necessarily ensuing upon the other, and of the greater importance in practical applications.[1]

---

[1] The Hebrew and Greek words are well known to signify *missing a mark*, *failing to reach an end.* Some hints upon the derivation of our English term

Considered with respect to the Moral Law, whether perfectly or imperfectly known, and from whatever source the knowledge of it may have been derived, Sin is the violation of it; and it evidently involves disaffection, neglect, opposition, rejection, contempt, and insult.

VII. Since God is the only uncaused, self-existent, and independent Being, possessing all possible perfections, the Author and Preserver of existence to all other beings, and the Source of all that constitutes the good of their existence; it follows that the essential principle of *happiness*, to a conscious mind, consists in the *manifested favour of God.*

The manifested favour of God consists in the assurance of being approved by him; the consciousness of possessing those enjoyments bestowed by him which are unequivocal evidences of his continued approbation; and the persuasion, resting upon his promise, that those blessings shall be extended, or succeeded by still greater ones, to immortality.

This is evidently *the supreme good* of man, or of any other creature; and, in its endless progression, the highest perfection of the human or any intelligent nature. It is described in Scripture by a variety of simple and expressive terms, often figurative, but always beautiful and heart-touching: such as life, eternal life,

will not be irrelevant. The celebrated philologist, James (Jacob) Grimm, has a Dissertation upon the term by which all the Teutonic languages, ancient and modern, designate this object, and which are, with the differences of dialect, the same as our Anglo-Saxon *syn*, English *sin*. He brings out the radical meaning to be *that which needs excuse*, *defence*, or finally *purification*. He admits its probable relation to the Latin *sons* (*injurious*, *criminal*), and the Greek σίνομαι, and its cognates σίνος, σίνις, σίντης (whose meaning is *injury*); but he adds that "the German [*Deutsche*-Teutonic] root is far more transparent." *Studien und Kritiken*, Ullmann, etc. vol. xii. p. 747, 1839. Our learned countryman, Dr Bosworth, had before published the same thing. —"SYN——may be considered as related to the Greek σίνειν (*nocere*, to hurt or injure). The Latin *sons* (guilty, criminal) belongs to the same family." *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, SYN. 1838.

glory, honour, heaven, the presence of God, the light of his countenance, the joy of his salvation, the fulness of joy, the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord, the crown of righteousness; the inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in the heavens; the pure river of the water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding from the throne of God and of the Lamb.

VIII. It is impossible that the favour of God should be directed towards a being under the power and dominion of sin.

In other words, a Being of all possible perfections cannot be regardless of justice and the due relations of things. This needs no proof. The truth of the assertion is self-evident to any man upon his understanding the terms. What a painful evidence it is of the depravity of our nature, that this plain axiom is practically so disregarded! A little reflection would see it to be the germ of the most momentous truths in theology and religion.

IX. A being under the power of sin is, both by that fact itself and by the necessary operation of the Divine Perfections, separated from the favour of God; and, since it has the powers of intelligence and reflection, it must be conscious of the separation. But the intensity of feeling, resulting from that consciousness, will be different, according to the degree of objective knowledge possessed in any given case.

Hence must accrue a feeling of unutterable and interminable loss, a sense of seclusion from the only source of real happiness, the privation of all that makes existence desirable, remorseful recollections, agonizing prospects,—DESPAIR.

Such would be the effect of sin in the progress of rational feelings, if its course were permitted to flow, without control or mitigation, according to its own nature and proper tendency. But in the present life, the operation of sin is impeded, and many of its most baneful effects are suspended, by innumerable interferences of the divine goodness. God has a purpose of mercy to fallen man. A system of grace is established, very gradual in its development, admirably complicated in its machinery, and inconceivably comprehensive in its designs and effects. Mankind are put under a discipline of providential circumstances and moral means; all having an adaptation to promote moral good, by awakening, rebuking, humbling, encouraging, and supplying the means of breaking those associations of feelings and ideas which are false and bad, and of forming others which are true and morally exalting. The divine system of mercy surrounds our guilty world with an atmosphere of natural and moral good, and scatters an endless variety of personal and social enjoyments. All the forms of occupation are produced, the competition of individuals, the grouping of communities, the collision of interests, and innumerable provisions of the remedial order. Hence arises endless employment for the senses, the affections, the memory, the imagination, the anticipations, and the active faculties of men. Thus, to a very great degree, the natural tendency of sin is counteracted during the season of merciful probation while yet, for purposes of benevolent monition, that baneful tendency is permitted to show itself by producing effects painful and sometimes horrid, on certain occasions, and to a certain extent. While the full and proper operation of sin is thus held back and suspended, enough is allowed to break through to demonstrate the fact of a sinful and ruined state, and that men may not be able to plead ignorance of their circumstances. Yet all these measures of condescending wisdom, beneficence, and warning, are perverted by men to the increase of sensuality, pride, security, insensibility, and all the forms of impious theory and obdurate practice. Experience and observation show that the character of duplicity, self-shielding and yet severely condemning others, which is drawn in the following description, is not the picture of a few only of mankind, but belongs to the whole species, under innumerable forms of subtilizing and refinement. "Wherefore, thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for, wherein thou judgest the other thou condemnest thyself; since thou thyself, who judgest, doest the same things. But we know that the judgment of God is according to truth, against those who do such things. And thinkest thou, ——that THOU shalt escape the judgment of God? Or despisest thou the riches of his kindness and forbearance and long-suffering; NOT ACKNOWLEDGING THAT THE KINDNESS OF GOD LEADETH THEE TO REPENTANCE?" Rom. ii. 1–4.

Besides this natural course and effect of sin, it is also to be considered in its relation to the retributive exercise of Divine Justice. Sin is a direct offence against the moral government of heaven; it is raising the flag of rebellion and defiance; it is striking at the root of that authority on which repose all the order and happiness of the universe. It therefore involves blame, guilt, and inexcusableness: and it DESERVES inflicted or positive punishment.

Compare the remarks under Proposition XXI.

X. The moral Law is a *faithful expression* of the infinite perfections of God, particularly his *rectitude*, including holiness, justice, and veracity: because the original truth and reason of things of which that law is the expression, is nothing else than the perfect and unchangeable nature of infinite moral goodness.

XI. This law must be *immutable* in its rights and requirements; for resting upon the basis of the divine perfections, it is not susceptible of improvement; nor can it permit relaxation, which would be sanctioning wrong and betraying itself.

The sentiments of these two propositions have also been shown above (under Proposition IV.) to follow, as necessary inferences, from the primary reason or ground of the Divine Law.

XII. God, whose essential excellence is the origin and example of all rectitude, and his authority the source of universal law, is the ultimate *object* of moral obedience and disobedience.

XIII. The *measure of obligation*, binding to yield obedience to any law, is in the compound ratio of the intrinsic propriety and excellence of the precept, and the right of the authority which enjoins it.

In the case before us, that of the Moral Law enjoined by God, both these considerations apply in the highest, that is, in an infinite degree. Therefore the *obligation* of this law is *infinite*, in these two views: first, that it is greater than any opposing considerations that can ever be adduced or conceived; and secondly, that it is limited only by the capacity of its subject, so that, in whatever way, and to whatever degree that may be increased through all future existence, the obligation will be still paramount.

XIV. An intelligent being is hurt or injured, when it is intentionally deprived, by a voluntary agent, of any property, right, enjoyment, or happiness, to which it has a just claim; or when it is molested or hindered in the enjoyment of its rights.

XV. The Deity is not capable of receiving physical injury: but he is susceptible of *moral injury*, by the diminution or total abstraction of the respect, love, and obedience which are due to him from any of his rational creatures.

XVI. Such injury sin inflicts upon the Great and ever Blessed God. It denies his right to, and diminishes or totally withholds his possession of, the *respect* which is due to him as the Head of the universe, the *love* which he deserves on account of his infinite excellences, and the *obedience* which he has commanded as the Sovereign Lord and Lawgiver.

The truth of this remark is obvious to even a superficial observer, in those overt acts of sin which contain a direct attack upon the perfections and authority of God; such as atheism, blasphemy, idolatry, perjury, profane expressions, and contempt of divine institutions: and slight reflection is sufficient to show that it is implied in all indifference and neglect of God, and the regards which he claims. But if any were to dispute the applicableness of the position to those dispositions and actions by which we sin against ourselves or our fellow-creatures, we would beg him to consider, that it is not the immediate reference only of any conduct that we have to bring into the account, but its indirect and ulterior bearing. If I violate or neglect to improve my own virtue, or if I transgress the rules of morality towards my fellow-creatures, I do indeed sin directly against myself or them; but my offence does not stop here. The laws which bind me to personal virtue and social morality are not less the laws of God, and the reason of them is not less founded in the original principles of moral right, than in the highest instances of devotional piety. In all the cases, God's express authority and command are violated; and therefore it is HE ultimately who is insulted and injured.

XVII. Moral obligation *fulfilled*, is either the immediate cause, or the less prominent yet necessary auxiliary, of all the order, harmony, and happiness in the intelligent universe: but the *violation* of moral obligation is the cause, proximately or remotely, of all the misery that has ever existed, or that ever can exist.

Compare the remarks under Proposition IX.

XVIII. The misery produced by the violation of moral obligation is *illimitable*, unless God be pleased, out of his sovereign goodness, to interfere for the purpose of counteracting it.

This is readily evinced by reflecting on the inevitable operation of the faculties of thought, association, memory, and anticipation (see Proposition IX.), so far as the offending individual is alone concerned. But, in consequence of the social constitution and innumerable connections of mankind, other persons besides the actual transgressor in any given case are involved in the consequences of his offences. Hence is the action of all injuries, of every kind and at every point in the scale of aggravation; by fraud, by violence, by withholding, by infliction, and in all ways whether direct or indirect; the effects of evil example; the seducing others into sin; the reciprocal emboldening and hardening of persons in a course of sin: and these, with all their correlative associations and direct results, multiply and diffuse themselves in every part of the awful progress. So far as the sphere of action can reach, sin corrupts, degrades, debases, and tends to make at once wretched and mischievous, every being that is susceptible of its influence.

XIX. *Retributive Justice* is the attribute of an intelligent agent, endowed with competent authority and power, by which it is disposed and enabled to render to other moral agents that treatment which is congruous to their dispositions and actions.

Retributive Justice is either *Remunerative* or *Punitive.*

XX. The Remunerative Justice of God is the exercise of his rectitude towards holy dispositions and actions, wherever existing, by all those manifestations and effects of his approbation, which may seem fit to his infinite wisdom and benignity.

Compare Proposition VII.

The manifestation of God's favour, in any way which to him may seem good, cannot but produce the highest possible happiness to the conscious mind. In Deity is nothing torpid or inert. The supreme perfection must be active in the communication of good, in every form, to every object, and by every method, which infinite wisdom and rectitude see to be fit and right. In all rational beings which shut not themselves out, by their sin, from this communion, every internal and external capacity of receiving delight, must be opened, and constantly filled from the source of all purity and joy. The habitual enjoyment of this unspeakable good, the inward serenity of a conscience unpolluted, and the indubitable prospect of this blissful existence to immortality, cannot but be productive of a steady, permanent, calm, yet exquisite, and ever-growing state of pleasure. "In thy presence is fulness of joys: at thy right hand, pleasures for evermore." With reference to his power to confer supreme good, He is styled "the happy and only Potentate;" and the grand instrument of his beneficence is marked with the same heaven-fraught allusion, "the gospel of the glory of the happy God." 1 Tim. vi. 15, and i. 11.

XXI. Punishment is some suffering, or natural evil, inflicted as the desert of moral evil, upon an accountable and offending being, by a competent authority, and according to a law previously made known.

On the natural and inevitable sense of moral desert, see the observations under Proposition III.

This is called *Positive* Punishment: and all the forms of natural evil which are the spontaneous or direct effects of sin, may be called *Natural* Punishment. See Proposition IX. The right to enact positive punishments, as the manifestations of displeasure against crime, and a mode of deterring by example from its commission, cannot be contested on any sound principles of reason. A system of government, domestic or patriarchal or national, never existed upon earth without them; nor indeed is it conceivable: for, without penal sanctions, a code of law would be nothing but a set of counsels or recommendations. That such sanctions have place in the Divine Government, is manifest from innumerable declarations of the inspired writings. Scarcely a page of scripture is without them, and in the didactic parts they occupy a very awakening prominence. They accompany the richest declarations of gospel-grace. They seal up the two great portions of the oracles of God; but the latter of them, the dispensation of love and mercy, in the more awful style of description.[1] That these denunciations are expressed in language borrowed from all that is most terrible in the powers of visible nature, cannot be viewed as authorising any diminishing of our sense of horror at the dreadful consequences of sin, but is only a demonstration of the condescension and earnestness of God; thus employing the most awful imagery to represent sufferings of which we cannot too strongly conceive, to shake our unfeeling souls, and to arouse us that we may "flee from the wrath to come;" and "escape the damnation of hell."

---

[1] "Then shall ye return and discern between the righteous and the wicked: between him that serveth God and him that serveth him not. For, behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." Mal. iii. 18, iv. 1. "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and sinners, and abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, will have their portion in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." Rev. xxi. 8. "God will add unto him the seven plagues which are written in this book." xxii. 18.

If, however, we were to forbear from urging, in the present argument, this awful branch of the dictates of natural reason and the disclosures of positive revelation; and if we were to insist only upon those exercises of Punitive Justice which are the spontaneous and necessary consequences of sin, as much as any natural effects of any natural causes; we should have grounds abundantly sufficient for the purposes of the present argument. Were we even to concede that the Deity could remit the positive punishments of sin, by a determination of his gracious will: yet this would not effect the salvation of the sinner. This measure of gracious will (the supposition of which, however, I by no means think tenable), would be merely *the forbearing from certain positive acts* of righteous power; merely *waiving a right;* merely *declining to effectuate* that which, speaking analogically, as the scriptures so often do, would be an insulated act in the procedure of the Blessed God, alien from the ordinary tendency and character of his government, and which he would not execute without the greatest reluctance, "his strange work."[1] But under a very different respect in moral consideration, would come the arbitrary taking away of the natural and necessary consequences of sin. *These are not inflictions*, but they are events and states of things which *follow of themselves*, according to the general constitutions of the universe, the laws of intellectual and moral nature; constitutions and laws which are essential to the harmony and well-being of God's entire world. To intercept this course of things, which infinite wisdom and goodness have established, to prevent these effects from ensuing, when their proper causes have already occurred, is not a case of forbearing to act; it is the exact reverse, it is a case of acting. It would be an interference of the Deity to suspend the operation of his own laws, to cut off the connexion between the cause and the effect, to change the course of nature: it would be *to work a miracle.*

---

[1] Isa. xxviii. 21.

XXII. According to universal experience and observation, and the undeviating testimony of history,[1] every individual of mankind who is capable of reflection, has just reason to consider himself as a transgressor against the Moral Law of God; and therefore guilty of violating the wise and good order of the universe, cut off from the favour of God, involved in the dreadful consequences of transgression, and deservedly exposed to all the penal sufferings which the justice of the divine government may have seen right to denounce.

That which is shown by fair evidence to belong to all men, so far as observation can reach, is justly to be considered as belonging to men universally.

XXIII. The testimony of the holy scriptures, of whose divine origin and authority we have previous and decisive evidence, confirms the inference from our own experience and observation; and it asserts, in the plainest terms, the universal sinfulness, guilt, and ruin of mankind.

Principal passages containing these assertions are Eph ii. 1–3. Rom. iii. 9–24. v. 6–10. See also the scriptural evidence adduced by Mr Edwards, Part II.

XXIV. The scriptures also, with equal strength and clearness, affirm the certainty and the tremendous effects of the exercise of God's punitive justice upon mankind as sinners.

---

[1] A most comprehensive and affecting picture of the evidence of this fact in the moral state of mankind, is in President Edwards on Original Sin, Part I., Chapter I.

See the preceding Discourse on the Sacrifice of Christ, page 28 and 42: and add 1 Sam. ii. 25. Ps. xi. 5, 6. ix. 17. Rom. ii. 2–9. i. 18. 2 Thess. i. 6–9. Rev. xxii. 15.

XXV. Man being in these awful circumstances, the following appear to be the only possible results:—

i. That God, by an act of omnipotence, deprive him of existence. But this supposition is opposed by two considerations.

1. We have no evidence from experiment, analogy, or revelation, that God ever has annihilated any being which he had brought into existence, material or spiritual; or that he ever will do so. All known facts in natural history, and all analogies from facts, support the reverse of this supposition.

2. The supposition implies that absolute power might be employed to counteract the demands of justice: which would be no other than making arbitrary will or mere force to be superior to the claims of rectitude and wisdom: for it has been shown (Prop. I.–IV.) that the perfect justice, which is essential to the Deity, is the necessary foundation of his moral government; and (Prop. VIII.) that it requires that sin should be adequately punished.

ii. That the Law of God be altered and abated, either in its requirements of obedience, or in its penal sanctions; or in both respects.

1. This would be a constructive acknowledgment on the part of the Supreme Lawgiver, that he had demanded more of the affections and obedience of his creatures than wisdom and equity warranted, or than he could persist in enforcing: in other terms, that his law had been imprudent and unjust, and that he was obliged to retrace his steps upon discovering their consequences:—suppositions so flagrantly inconsistent with

the foreknowledge and the moral attributes of God, that to mention them is sufficient for their rejection.

2. As the demands of the law are nothing more than that justice should be done, any receding from those demands would be so far a legalizing of injustice: that is, it would cause the Being whose essential character is infinite rectitude, to be a promoter of sin, and an accessory to his own wrong and to the disparagement of the whole holy universe.

3. An abrogation of the sanction would amount to this; that, though the moral cause, sin, remained, its proper effects should not follow: which is the same as determining that the reasons of justice, though still existing, should not be acted upon, but that the Deity should interpose, by his omnipotence, to protect and patronize sin.

iii. That the proper effects of sin fall upon the sinner, according to the just and natural course of things.

Dreadful but righteous result!—Yet be it recollected that, in whatever instances this case may be ever realized, God will be displayed to the fullest conviction of all upright beings, to have been throughout holy and just, good and glorious.

But this is the case, to avoid which is the great object of our most serious inquiries. "How can man be just with God?—What shall I do, that I may be saved?"

iv. That some compensative resource be discovered and carried into effect, by which the salvation of the sinner shall be obtained, in consistency with the honours of the divine government.

And THIS, we gratefully believe, HAS BEEN EFFECTED, BY THE WISDOM AND HOLINESS OF GOD, TO THE PRAISE OF THE GLORY OF HIS GRACE. To communicate the knowledge and enjoyment of this unspeakable gift, is the chief purpose of divine revelation.

Some presumptions might have been argued, in favour of this cheering hope, from the preservation of the human race and the extensive benignity of providence, more and more unfolded in the discoveries of science and the inventions of art, under the admitted circumstances of human depravity and guilt; from the analogy of numerous blessings communicated to men, by instruments of a mediatorial and remedial kind; and from declarations in the scriptures assuring us of Jehovah's gracious readiness to pardon and save sinners, while the same scriptures as strongly assure us of his unchangeable holiness and justice.

The positive evidence upon which we are enabled to rest our assurance of this heart-reviving truth, and its connexions with the whole process of raising our nature to its highest moral perfection, it is the object of the other parts of this volume to elucidate. The writer will have the greatest reasons to be thankful and happy, if this end be accomplished.

"Knowing, therefore, the terror of the Lord, we persuade men: and we are made manifest unto God. By grace ye are saved, through faith; and this is not of yourselves, it is the gift of God."

DISCOURSE IV.

ON THE REDEMPTION EFFECTED BY CHRIST.

Every reader of the New Testament must be aware that the work of our Lord Jesus Christ, for the deliverance of man from his state of sin, is frequently represented by language borrowed from pecuniary transactions among men; sometimes by the liquidating of a debt, and so obtaining the release of the imprisoned debtor; and sometimes by the payment of a ransom for the deliverance of a captive taken in war. Both these are familiar ideas to men; especially in turbulent times and countries, such as were those in which the phraseology of the scriptures was formed. That, in application to our present subject, they are metaphorical; and that they both coincide in the leading idea of *relief* from a state of ruin by means of *a commutation;* scarcely need to be observed. But, as this figure has furnished occasion for unjust and impious scoffing on the one hand; and on the other, for ignorant, extravagant, and highly mischievous declamation, by persons professing to hold the orthodox doctrine; it is a desirable object to place it in a clear and scriptural light.

It will be useful, first, to elucidate the signification of λύειν and its derivatives belonging to our case, by a few examples from authors who wrote in Attic or in common Greek, the nearest approach of the classical to the New Testament diction. This verb, whose general meaning is to *release*, is used to denote both the act of him who has a captive in his power, and who, for any consideration (ἄποινα or λύτρα), *sets him at liberty*, and the act of one who *procures the liberation*, by paying a ransom or any other means: but in the latter sense the middle voice is most generally, and with stricter propriety used. So we read in Demosthenes, "The laws enjoin that (ὁ λυθεὶς) he who is ransomed from the enemy, should be the property (τοῦ λυσαμένου) of the person who has redeemed him, unless (ἀποδῷ λύτρα) he repay the ransom-price." Hence, λύτρον, ἐπιλύτρον, and the plural λύτρα denote the *ransom-price;* ἀντιλύτρον expresses the idea of commutation a little more strongly: λυτροῦν, ἀπολυτροῦν, and ἐκλυτροῦν signify *to pay that price;* λύτρωσις, ἀπολύτρωσις, and ἐκλύτρωσις, the *act* of ransoming, and, by a metonymy which is almost universal in the use of abstract nouns, the *effect* of such ransoming or the *state produced by it.* Some of these words occur more rarely in the general sense of their primitive to denote deliverance by any means. A small number of citations will answer our purpose of indicating the force of the words in their ordinary use and application. Aristotle mentions it among the difficult questions in morals, "Whether to a man who has been (λυτρωθεὶς) *ransomed* from a company of banditti (τὸν λυσάμενον ἀντιλυτρωτέον), it is a duty to ransom in return the person who had before ransomed him, whosoever he might be, or to repay the amount to that person, supposing him to require it; at the very time when his own father had been taken, and the sum of money, being all that the person had, was wanted for his (the father's) redemption." (*Ethic. Nicom. lib. i. cap. ii.*) Diodorus says, of the inhabitants of the Balearic isles, that "when any of their females are carried off by pirates making a descent on their shores, they (*ἀντὶ μιᾶς γυναικὸς γ' ἢ δ' ἄνδρας διδόντες λυτροῦνται*) will give three or four men in ransom for one woman." (*Diod. Sicul. lib. v. cap. xvii.*) He relates that Hercules "released Melanippe (*ἀπελύτρωσεν, ἀντιλαβὼν τὸν ζωστῆρα*), taking her girdle as the price of her ransom." (*lib. iv. cap. xvi.*) Similar instances are contained in other passages of this author, whose age and style number him among such Greek writers as approach the most nearly to the language of the New Testament.

These examples will lead us at once to the right conception of the sense of the terms in the New Testament declarations. "The Son of Man came,—to give his own life a ransom for many." Matt. xx. 28. "Who gave himself a ransom for all." 1 Tim. ii. 6. "Who gave himself for us, that he might ransom us from all iniquity," that is, from the state and condition of sin. Tit. ii. 14. "Ye were redeemed—with the precious blood of Christ." 1 Pet. i. 18. "Justified freely, by his grace, through the redemption which is by Christ Jesus." Rom. iii. 24. "Christ—made unto us from God—redemption." 1 Cor. i. 30. "By whom we have the redemption, through his blood; the forgiveness of our offences." Eph. i. 7. Col. i. 14. "Through his own blood,—having obtained eternal redemption." Heb. ix. 12. "Death being inflicted, in order to the redemption of the transgressions which were under the first covenant." v. 15. Here *ἀπολύτρωσις* is rendered by Michaelis *expiation* or *atonement*. See above, page 108. The great Ernesti translates the verse thus:— "And on that account also he is, and is declared, Mediator of the new covenant, in order that, by the intervening of death to atone for sins which could not be expiated under the first covenant, believers might receive the possession of eternal life." Schleusner thinks that the reference is to the sins of the believing Hebrews before their conversion.[1]

There is another class of passages in which the metaphor is represented by *ἀγοράζειν to buy* and *ἐξαγοράζειν to buy back again*, or often simply *to buy*, but with a frequent application to the redemption of captives. "Ye are not your own: for ye are bought with a price of great value;" (*τιμῆς*, very properly so rendered by De Sacy, Le Cène, Michaelis, and Van Ess.) 1 Cor. vi. 20. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, becoming the curse instead of us." Gal. ii. 13.[2] "Ὑπὲρ with a genitive, *over*, *for*, *on account of*, *in the name*, or *in the room* of another." *Schneider's Wörterbuch.*—" *For*, that is, *for the protection*, *security*, or *deliverance* of any :—Ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώζεσθαι, *for the saving of any one; ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν*, *to save* from death." *Passow's Wbch.* "Made under the law, that he might redeem those [who were] under the law." iv. 5. "Thou wast slain (*ἐσφάγης*, strictly *slaughtered*, the word commonly used to denote the slaying of sacrifices): and thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood." Rev. v. 9. "The redeemed from the earth:—the redeemed from men." xiv. 3, 4.

A form of expression, which is so frequently and solemnly employed in "the oracles of God," cannot, however figurative it may be, but have suitableness and wisdom in it. The impious ridicule which some persons are in the habit of throwing upon it, who still would be called Christians, ought to excite our pity for them, but not for a moment deter us from making full use of it, provided we transgress not the sobriety and chasteness of scripture. A little reflection may show us that the metaphor rests upon very just and instructive analogies, and that it involves no suppositions inconsistent with the attributes of God, or the dignity of sacred things.

---

[1] The instances in which the terms are used in a more large and general signification, appear to be these: *Λυτροῦσϑαι·* Luke xxiv. 21. *Λύτρωσις·* i. 68. ii. 38. *᾿Απολύτρωσις·* xxi. 28. Rom. viii. 23. Eph. i. 14. iv. 30. Heb. xi. 35. *Λυτρωτής·* Acts vii. 35.

[2] For the reason of the omission of the article, though *κατάρα* is definite, see *Bishop Middleton on the Greek Article*, p. 62-66.

That the idea of something sordid and degrading should be associated with that of pecuniary accuracy, is one of the affectations of a corrupt state of society. Justice in commutation was probably the earliest, as it is the plainest and most familiar case of exact righteousness between man and man. It is therefore a fit representative of whatever is honourable; and it would naturally grow into an established metaphor to denote EQUITY, both in particular cases and in the abstract. Hence also, forms of speech could not but be derived, and extended to the whole range of moral obligation. The obedience of the members of a community to the laws and to the public organ of their administration, would be readily described as a *debt due* from each individual to the government; so long as the government maintained its title to obedience, by its own fidelity to the general good. From the language of pecuniary payments probably all nations have formed their customary terms, for expressing the *suit and service* and *all manner of dues*, which are *owing* from every private member of the community to its legal head. It is also obvious that these dues may, by negligence, evasion, or rebellion, be withheld, in part or entirely. In such case, since the original obligation not only is not cancelled, but does not sustain the smallest abatement, it is equally obvious that there accrues an *accumulation* of obligation: and how could this state of things be represented better than by the language of commercial or pecuniary engagement? This mode of expression would be rendered still more appropriate by the fact, that a material part of the dues claimed by the wisest and best human governments, is required and paid in money, as being the most convenient instrument of exchange for procuring all other commodities and services. Let it be further considered, that the practice of attaching the persons of debtors, especially on public suit, either as a means of procuring payment or as a punishment for dishonesty, has been generally established in civilized societies; and that such a provision, under proper modifications, appears essential to any efficient system of national law.

In reference to the other source of the metaphor, it is sufficient to observe that, in ancient warfare, the lives of prisoners taken were held to be at the disposal of the conqueror; and that the acceptance of a ransom, to buy back the life and liberty of the prisoner, became generally established, when barbarous maxims were somewhat weakened, and considerations of policy and mercy began to take a permanent hold upon the minds of men.

Upon these foundations the scriptural metaphor under consideration is built; and it was strengthened and made the more familiar and expressive by some parts of the Hebrew code, particularly the law of inheritances. It followed that the language thus established was currently applied to any signal interposition of the power and mercy of the Most High, for the deliverance of men from trouble and misery. Numerous examples occur in the Old Testament, referring to the deliverances from Egypt, from the Babylonish captivity, and from other national oppressions.[1] I shall cite only one example. "I am Jehovah, thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour. I give Egypt for thy ransom, Cush and Seba in thy stead. Since thou art dear in my sight, highly esteemed, and I love thee; therefore I will give men in thy stead, and nations instead of thy life." Is. xliii. 3, 4.[1] Here the ideas of deliverance, ransom, and substitution are plainly developed. Our Lord also repeatedly represents the forgiveness of sins by the image of remitting debts. Matt. vi. 12. Luke vii. 41–48. The justness of both the metaphors will be apparent from a little consideration.

---

[1] For instance; Exod. xv. 13. Deut. xv. 15. Is. lii. 2.

The holy and righteous government of God cannot connive at sin, in its commission; nor can interpose, by measures of mere will and power, to cut off its entail of just and necessary consequences. But the obligations of sinners to obedience are not in the least degree relaxed by the fact of their disobedience. Their repugnance to the law of God, their rooted unwillingness to comply with his reasonable requirements, can effect no diminution of their duty. That debt is still owing, and is ever accumulating; while there is also the tremendous *addition* of another obligation, the obligation to abide by the effects of disobedience, as already incurred. This state of twofold obligation is an evident result of the laws of intellectual and moral nature, and the revealed law of the Impartial Ruler, who will " do right " in every respect. No powers of their own can exonerate sinful beings from this state of obligation. The original claim, and the consequences of having violated it, continue to press upon them. But judgment is not immediately enforced. The forbearing mercy of God grants time, and respites execution. The state of waiting, while as yet the awful effects of sin have not fully disclosed themselves, has an obvious resemblance to the state of a captive detained by his enemy, or a debtor in prison, or a convicted criminal chained in his condemned cell.

---

[1] "A figurative mode of speech, used also in our European languages. When a calamity, which appeared impending over a nation, or had already begun to affect it, actually falls upon another; it is said, that the one became a sacrifice for the other. Stripped of its figure the meaning of the verse is this: *Thou shalt be delivered from thy present calamity, but Egypt shall on this very account be overwhelmed with calamity.* This took place under the Persian monarchy, which was eminently favourable to the Jews. Cyrus granted them their return to the land of their fathers, and permitted them to rebuild their city and temple. The following kings protected them, in this undertaking, against their enemies, who endeavoured to hinder the slowly proceeding work. Those monarchs also gave them many munificent presents out of the royal treasury; and the Jews never enjoyed such a long duration of peace and prosperity, even in their best times, as they possessed through the two hundred years that they lived under the Persians. No war came within their borders, they worshipped the One God, as his peculiar people, hey were objects of favour to the Persian rulers, and probably the example of this nation, which made so grand a figure upon the theatre of the world, had the effect of entirely taking away the propensity of the Jews to idolatry. But the case was altogether the reverse with Egypt. To that country, the Persian dominion was to the last degree oppressive. Cambyses, the son of Cyrus, conquered it, and treated the vanquished people very harshly. He even ordered the bodies of their kings to be dug out of the repositories of the dead, and to be burned. Yet the burning was no indignity, for it was agreeable to the Persian manners and laws. See Herodotus, Book III. chap. xv." *Michaelis, Uebers. u. Anmerk.* See Supplementary Note XXV.

These images somewhat vary from each other ; and it would require little wit or talent, in any profane man, to turn them into burlesque : but an honest mind perceives the general features to be obvious and accordant. Man is insolvent, condemned, and a captive. The detaining power is the Justice of the Divine Government, and a wise regard to the public good. The state of sin involves an actual slavery of the soul. It is taken captive and fettered, misled and abused, by criminal passions. There is also another fact, which adds still further to the propriety and instructive character of this class of metaphors. The state of sin includes a real subjection to the dominion and influence of wicked spirits. The grounds, from both philosophy and revelation, for believing the existence of superior orders of intelligent creatures, and that some of these have become irreclaimably wicked, need not here be stated. That such beings should be both able and disposed to use their powers for the injury of human creatures, is not antecedently more incredible than the existence of deleterious effects on the health and life of men, from the conditions of the atmosphere, and innumerable other physical causes, which science cannot control or even comprehend; or that of a malignant influence, often terminating in utter perdition, exercised by some wicked men upon others, in the various forms of temptation to sin. Hence the principal of these evil beings (who is, by a common and natural metonymy, often mentioned singly when the design of the writer is to include the whole band of his fellow-conspirators), is called "the god of this world, the spirit which now worketh in the children of disobedience, filling their hearts, deceiving and beguiling them, and leading them captive;" and the entire system of this seducing and enslaving influence is called "the power of darkness, the kingdom of Satan." Between this leader of evil and his victims, there is an identity of moral principles, a conformity of character, an agreement in the choice of an end, and in the use of means to reach it: they are his willing victims.

In this sense I conceive it is, that "the devil" is said to "have the power of death." Heb. ii. 14. Of natural and temporal death, as it affected the human race after the fall, he was the remoter cause, having been the seducer of mortals to sin; and "death entered into the world by sin." But of death in its most ample and terrible sense, the death of the soul, the loss of happy being, "the eternal death," this "murderer from the beginning" is the *chieftain;* the first in the guilt and condemnation, and maliciously labouring to seduce others into the same ruin, that he may then taunt and tyrannize over these confederates in rebellion, and partakers in its consequent wretchedness.

Is it not then with the greatest propriety, that the work of mercy, in delivering any of mankind from this dreadful thraldom, is represented as an emancipation out of the power of a cruel tyrant, by the hand of a stronger than he? And that, since this exercise of power is made in righteousness, the deliverance should be referred to the *ground* of that righteousness in the sacrifice of Christ? "The Father hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God."

In another passage, the great deliverance of the gospel is represented by both the figures in conjunction, *the cancelling of a debt* (which was anciently signified by driving a nail through the bond or deed of obligation), and *the emancipating of captives* by the conquest of their oppressors and a triumph over them. It must also be brought to mind, that the ceremonial ordinances of the Mosaic law were a perpetual memorial of sin as involving exposure to punishment, and of the inability of a sinner to effect his own deliverance; so that their abolition amounted to a declaration that an effectual provision was now made for the pardon of sin by the Righteous Judge, and for the everlasting deliverance of those who had been the slaves of sin and the captives of wicked spirits. "And you, who were dead [in your moral state and by the sentence of the law] in your offences and in the uncircumcision of your flesh [your state of alienation from the revelation of divine mercy in the Israelitish dispensation], God hath made alive with him [*i.e.* Christ], having forgiven you all your trespasses; having blotted out the hand-writing [*chirograph*, the ancient term for a deed of pecuniary obligation] in the ordinances, which stood against us, which was opposed to us; and took it completely away by nailing it to his cross: having despoiled principalities and powers, he displayed them openly, triumphing over them by it." Col. ii. 13–15.

Again; let us ask, What idea had the apostle when he supposed the case of some one *dying for a righteous man?* Was it not the undergoing of this suffering, that the person intended to be benefited might be released from it? Now it is plainly with a similar view that Christ is there declared to have "died for us, when we were yet sinners,"—"without strength,"—that is, in the state of our dreadful fall, stunned as it were and lying in a helpless and perishing condition. But from *what* are believers in Christ released by his death? Not from corporal death; for that they all do and must endure, without any distinction, as to the physical suffering, from the rest of mankind. The evil, shown to be so unspeakably tremendous, and from which the deliverance could be effected only in this astonishing manner, must therefore have been something different from natural death, and incomparably more dreadful. But there is no other greater evil, to which the argument can possibly be applied, except that which the apostle *actually affirms;* SIN, and its penal consequence WRATH, that is, the punishment of sin determined, not by arbitrary dominion, but by the incorruptible and unerring justice of God. "When we were still fallen, Christ at the destined time died for us as guilty persons. Scarcely would any one die for an innocent person (though perhaps, to die for a very good and beneficent person, some one might once take up the hard resolution), but God demonstrates his love towards us in that, when we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. How much more then shall we now, after that we have been declared righteous on account of his blood, be, through him, saved and made free from punishment? For if, though we were still enemies, we have been reconciled to God through the death of His Son, how much more shall we, as being already reconciled, be saved through his life? And not that merely, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have received the reconciliation."[1]

These considerations are, I trust, sufficient to show that whatever means have been appointed by the wisdom and mercy of God, as fit and efficient to render this great deliverance compatible with the rectitude of his government, may be most properly and justly expressed by the payment of a debt or of a ransom-price, and by the intervention of a power exercised in righteousness.

We need not, therefore, to be afraid or ashamed to use these scriptural metaphors, provided we keep within the sobriety of scripture-precedent. But it must be confessed that ignorance, bad taste, and weak judgment, find a great facility in using them extravagantly and driving them to excess. Of this folly and mischief many of the Christian fathers, were guilty, to a degree which would appear almost incredible, if recited to well instructed Christians in modern times. The declamations of those who are deemed Antinomians and enthusiasts among us, are sober and decent, in comparison with some passages of those early writers, who are often extolled as if they had possessed an authority approaching to that of inspiration, and to whom even some Protestants advise us to look, as our best guides for the interpretation of Scripture, and as the safe depositories of apostolic doctrine."[1]

---

[1] Rom. v. 6-11. Closely rendered from Michaelis's translation, published in 1790, the year before his death: and I have here adopted it, not merely on account of so great an authority, but because, though not a literal rendering it is a most faithful representation of the original.

In the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* of Ullmann and Umbreit (vol. iv. 1831), is a short essay by a Lutheran clergyman, Mr Schaubach, superintendent at Meiningen, the object of which is to show that any form of professed Christianity which regards Christ as only a teacher of piety and virtue [though he might be the greatest and most perfect that ever existed, even commissioned and inspired by the Deity], does not come up to the idea of an institution for the highest interests of mankind, which he regards as the evident *essence* of the Christian religion; an *institution* (*anstalt*), he urges, and not a mere set of instructions; an arrangement and application of effective agency for the beneficent end. The author repudiates the being an adherent of any rigid, artificial, human system of orthodoxy; but maintains that an unfettered *exegesis* of the New Testament brings out the necessity of maintaining that the life, sufferings, and death of Jesus Christ constituted a WORK of REDEMPTION for the sinful and ruined race of men. He adds,—"These observations are not intended to be a complete representation of the subject. Only a few passages may be shortly touched upon. Matt. xx. 28; 'The Son of Man came not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life a ransom (αντὶ) instead of many.' The work of the Messiah is a *ransoming-work;* compare with Luke i. 68, 'ransoming,' and 74, 'being delivered.' This ransoming [or redeeming, *erlösung*], as the sense in which Jesus habitually used the term, did not refer to anything earthly, could be accomplished only by suffering and death. Confirmed by Matt. xvi. 21; 'From that time Jesus began to show to his disciples, that he must go up to Jerusalem, and endure many sufferings from the elders and the chief priests and the scripture-teachers [the Sanhedrim], and be put to death; and on the third day be raised again:' Luke xxiv. 26; 'Was it not necessary that the Messiah should endure these sufferings, and [thereby] enter into his glory?' The expectation was, that he would come forwards as a worldly Sovereign, who would make himself to be attended and served with the greatest splendour; but, on the contrary, he shows that the work to which he was called, laid upon him an office of servitude (διακονία), and that he must bring his own life as a sacrifice, for the purpose of completing the *ransom.* For the founding of his kingdom, a *ransom-price* was necessary, which he himself would be obliged to present for many, in order to purchase them to be his own peculiar possession. These words must be thus explained, if we follow their most natural connexion. This interpretation is confirmed by Luke xxiv. 21; 'We hoped that this was he that would (λυτροῦσθαι) ransom Israel.' An earthly ransoming was hoped for from him; but he assures his disciples, altogether contrary to their expectation, that sufferings and death were requisite for the accomplishment of his work. On this account, the doctrine of the cross was to the Jews (σκάνδαλον) an offence. The 'entering into his glory' is the completing of the ransoming, the re-establishing of the kingdom of Heaven; which consists not in benefits for our bodily existence, but in spiritual blessings,—peace with God, complete salvation, 'repentance and the forgiveness of sins.' Thus Jesus taught a connexion of his death with the ransoming, but not in a metaphysical sense" [as merely an ideality, which would resolve itself into some figurative notion]. "He was a Deliverer; but to be such, the sacrifice of his generous labours and sufferings was indispensable. The subject is further illustrated by 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. In that passage, the miserable state, out of which Christ delivered men, is 'the (ἀναστροφή) vain course of conduct received by tradition from their fathers;' the happiness to which he brought them is the 'living hope;' the way and manner by which he effected this, is a *ransoming;* and the *ransom-price* by which he bought them out of that state of slavery, to be his own peculiar possession, consisted not in gold or silver, but in something of a higher nature, 'the precious blood of Christ as a spotless and unblemished lamb.' The work of Redemption is a constitution of Propitiation."

---

[1] This was published several years before the Oxford "Tracts for the Times" commenced their sinistrous course; fallacious in argument, antichristian in principle, and in tendency and result threatening to the highest interests of mankind; both civil freedom and immortal hopes; awfully realizing the delusion of old, rebuked by the prophet, "Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, are these!" Jer. vii. 4.—Yet let not the scriptural Christian be dismayed. The peaceful victory awaits "the faith of God's elect, and the acknowledgment of the truth according to godliness." Tit. i. 1. If the reader have any hesitation to give credence to the charges of sillinesses beneath contempt, and fraudulence the most impudent, against the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, his doubts will be removed on examining the citations in the "Ancient Christianity," by Isaac Taylor, Esq., especially in the first volume.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

AND

ILLUSTRATIONS.

NOTE I.—page 19.

MICHAELIS ON THE EARLY NOTIONS OF SACRIFICE.

'Almost all nations have been unanimous in the idea of bringing to the Deity offerings, particularly with the shedding of blood, as a means of obtaining pardon of sin and restoration to favour. This awful idea, which is the almost universal impression of the human race, even seems to be a product of what the Romans called *sensus communis;* a natural dictate of the sound understanding of man. But it may not have had this origin. It may reasonably be regarded as a relic of the primitive world, having descended from the time in which the ancestors of all nations formed one society. This supposition is confirmed by what we find in the most ancient records preserved in the Bible; both long before the Deluge (Gen. iv. 4, 5), and immediately after it (ch. viii. 20), before mankind were scattered into different countries.

"To do justice to this so widely diffused sentiment of men. we must observe three distinct things.

"1. Shall sacrifices be regarded as a gift presented to the Deity, as it were to bribe him to remit the punishment of sin? Nothing can be imagined more low-minded and unbecoming to God. Besides, the animal world is entirely and absolutely his property: we have no right over any part of it, except what he gives, who is the Creator and Lord of Nature. The offering profits him not: he cannot be allured by presents, like a human judge. Also, nothing could be baser than the pretence of administering justice and allowing the guilty party to buy off his punishment. To a man who was rich enough to bring ample gifts, it would be a free license to commit any crime without fear or shame; and the ends of punitive justice would be entirely defeated. Thus considered, the idea is plainly seen to be mean and detestable; and equally so is it when money or any other valuable is put in place of the sacrifice, and is offered to the Deity only in show, but is in reality taken by another, commonly a knavish priest.

"2. May it then be supposed that the punishment of sin is actually transferred from the human sinner to the sacrificed animal, and is executed upon it? Against such a notion, the words of Paul (Heb. x. 4) are the clear and luminous declaration of sound reason: 'It is not possible that the blood of bulls or goats should take away sin.' What a disparity, between the person who has deserved the punishment and the vastly inferior creature which is punished in his stead! And what right has he to transfer his own penalty to a poor unintelligent being, which has not given, which cannot give, its consent thereto? The ends of punishment would not be attained, even in appearance; for who would be deterred from sin, if the punishment were to be executed, not upon himself the offender, but upon an animal which he brings, and which, though it may be his first and best, yet for such a purpose has no propriety or relation? Rather would it be an encouragement to sin. A magistrate among men would be reckoned a perfect fool who should release a criminal adjudged to imprisonment: and instead of him shut up in the dungeon for a few days, his dog, or any other pet animal. No wiser do sacrifices seem, if they be supposed to be, in a proper sense, a satisfaction for sin. It is also to be considered, that death is what the animals must look for; and many of the most useful animals must undergo a violent death by the hand of man. To them it is equal, whether they die by the knife of the butcher or that of the priest. Death, thus inflicted, loses the idea of penalty: it is a phantasmagoria, a mockery, a nothing.

"3. But propitiatory sacrifices are capable of another explanation, which is agreeable to reason, yea even it would reflect honour upon the soundest human understanding; only it needs a previous fact, that of a Divine Appointment. It may be the gracious pleasure of God to forgive sins upon the great and indispensable condition of deep repentance and thorough reformation; but with the annexation of another indispensable condition, that of *bringing a sacrifice.* This would have two objects in view:

"(1.) That every person who seeks forgiveness should first make a solemn and open *confession* of his sin.

"(2.) That, in the sacrifice, he should behold in the most striking manner *the punishment* which he has deserved, *death* and penalties *after death*, as the slain sacrifice was consumed by fire; and thus should *acknowledge* himself to have deserved this punishment.

"This actually took place with the sacrifices of the Old Testament.

"If this were the intention of sacrifices, still they would be merely outward signs and ceremonies, and the question would still remain, WHAT are the necessary conditions upon which God is willing to forgive sin? And how will the designs of the penal infliction (to deter from sin, to set an example, to show that the lawgiver duly cares for the welfare of obedient subjects) be secured, if he releases the offender from the penalties, upon his offering the sacrifice?

"But there are also other grounds of doubt against sacrifices as being the condition of forgiveness, which make it at least extremely unlikely that the Deity would prescribe this condition to all men, in all periods of time, down to the most advanced age of the world.

"1. With respect to many sins that we commit (since they lie not only in actions and words but also in thoughts), it would be impossible to provide a sacrifice for each and every one. If it be said that the sacrifice may have its reference to sin in the abstract and general sense; then the first advantage or condition that we have mentioned, either fails entirely, or is shifted off into such a universal acknowledgment of what all men always knew, that one can hardly see why God should esteem it so necessary; why he should not be satisfied with the confession of secret prayer, which is often so full of deep emotion.

"2. There are indeed some sins of which a public confession is needful and beneficial; for instance, perjury [by which an injury had been inflicted, which must be repaired]. But, with regard to some other sins, there would be no apparent advantage in it; and there is a third class in which such a dragging into notoriety would be absolutely pernicious. Of many acts of wickedness it is for the general good that they should be as little known as possible; yea, that the world should even not know that there ever were such sins. Of many sinful actions the shame and ignominy would be taken away, if all who have committed them were to confess it publicly. It would be exceedingly pernicious, on moral grounds, for men thus to publish their own disgrace. It would destroy the sensibility to honour and shame, which is of the greatest importance in resisting the solicitations of vice;—for we can ill spare even the inferior and collateral motives to resistance. The loss of honourable estimation is a great moral injury.

"3. That which has been mentioned as the second design of sacrifice, the demonstrating to the sinner, in a manner addressed to the senses and formed of figurative resemblances, *what he deserves;* is certainly a method well adapted to the early state of the world and the infancy of the human race. It could not but be exceedingly beneficial, at that time, when God instituted the rite of sacrifice. But, in an advanced state of the world, that benefit declines and even sinks to nothing. Death, pointed out generally by a sacrifice as a sensible image of punishment, would not affect the mind nearly so much [in a numerous population and a polished state of society], as doctrine and admonition addressed to the reason.

"Probably it will be thought that I write this in vindication of the religion of the Old Testament, making sacrifice the condition of the forgiveness of sin, and treating the world before Christ as in a state of childhood. But this is not my present design. The religion revealed through Moses to the Israelites did not represent sacrifice as the condition of remitting the punishments due to sin in the future state, not even to the Israelites. It was only for some kinds of sins that sacrifices were directed to be brought. None were appointed for sins of the thoughts, however deliberate and determined they might be: nor any for certain gross transgressions, as murder or adultery, for which the penalty of death was ordained. Yet God was willing to forgive such sins. David, in the 51st Psalm, prays for forgiveness, and expressly says that he would bring no sin-offering, for it would not be acceptable to God. The forgiveness which Moses promised to the offerer of sacrifice, was merely a remission of the punishments which referred to the present life and the national constitution of the Israelites; not extending to the judgment awaiting men in the life to come. The sacrifices effected what the lawyers call an abatement of the nuisance. Therefore, the Old Testament plainly taught that those offerings were a prefigurative representation of *a better sacrifice.*—See Psalm xl. 6–9: and my *Law of Moses*, sect. 189, 244." *J. D. Michaelis* (*Gedanken über die Lehre der heiligen Schrift von Sünde und Genugthuung, als eine der Vernunft gemässe Lehre*); *Reflections on the Doctrine of the Bible concerning Sin and Satisfaction, as a Doctrine agreeable to Reason;* p. 604–611. Göttingen, 1779.

NOTE II.—page 20.

ON HUMAN SACRIFICES.

An account of the nations that used these horrid rites is in *Grotius de Satisf. Christi, cap.* x. A more detailed and interesting statement occurs in the valuable work (one of his *best*) of our great nonconformist divine, *Dr John Owen, de Natura, etc. Veræ Theol.* cap. viii. § 33–41. A profusion of facts and authorities with regard to almost every part of the earth, is in *M. Beyer's Addit. Seldeni Lib. de Diis Syris,—Moloch; Saubertus de Sacrificiis Veterum*, cap. xxi.; and in *Dr Magee's* very valuable work on *Atonement and Sacrifice*, Diss. V., which not only supplies many ancient instances, but is particularly copious with regard to the extensive prevalence of these cruelties in modern nations. To these much, very much, might be added, which has been but recently brought to light, both of the manners of existing nations in Asia, Africa, and America, and the awful disclosures of human life as it existed three thousand years ago in Italy. See Mrs Hamilton Gray's *Tour to the Sepulchres of Etruria*, and the *Edinb. Review*, April, 1841; p. 127. The sum of the evidence from the almost innumerable witnesses, may be given in the words of Cicero, concerning the ancient Gauls.—"When, alarmed by any cause of terror, they think that their gods must be appeased, they pollute their altars and temples with human sacrifices! Under pretence of religion they violate its very first dictates! Is it not notorious, that, to this day, they retain that horrid and savage practice of immolating their fellow-creatures?" *Or. pro M. Fonteio*, § 10. But in revolting atrocity, the bad pre-eminence seems due to a rite of the Thessalians recorded by Lucan, in words too shocking to be translated:

> Nec refugit cædes, vivum si sacra cruorem,
> Extaque funereæ poscunt trepidantia mensæ:
> Volnere sic ventris, non, qua natura vocabat,
> Extrahitur partus, calidis ponendus in aris.
>
> PHARSAL. VI. 556.

"I consider sacrifices as the basis of all religion, and the death of Abel as the first type of that sacrifice which forms the groundwork of Christianity. In whatever way we decide upon this opinion, it affords much room for thought. The greater part of ancient religions instituted human sacrifices: but in this barbarity there was something remarkable, namely, the necessity of a solemn expiation. Nothing, in effect, can obliterate from the soul the idea, that there is a mysterious efficacy in the blood of the innocent, and that heaven and earth are moved by it. Men have always believed that the just could obtain, in this life or the other, the pardon of the guilty. There are some primitive ideas in the human species, which reappear, with more or less disfigurement, in all times and among all nations. These are the ideas upon which we cannot grow weary of reflecting; for they assuredly preserve some traces of the lost dignities of our nature." *Mad. de Staël's Germany*, vol. iii. p. 308. Engl. transl.—P. iv. ch. iv.

An able writer, but who shows himself unfriendly to those views of religion which the majority of serious Christians regard as true and infinitely important, has given *a summary of facts* upon this subject, which well merits to be cited.

"No one can deny that, in countries so remote from one another, as to preclude all supposition of communication of opinion, the approval of *human sacrifice* has constantly prevailed in the early stages of society. Europe, Asia, Africa, and America, all furnish proofs of the uniform approbation bestowed on deliberate and disinterested murder during the infancy of social life. No explanation can be given of the infernal custom, by saying it was introduced by those who pretended to hold intercourse with divinities; unless it can be shown that such persons were gainers by its practice. What could priests gain by it, except in nations of cannibals? Neither the Celts, the Peruvians, the Mexicans, nor the early Greeks were cannibals. So truly meritorious was the practice esteemed, that it was thought *more likely than any thing else* to propitiate the favour of the Deity, at all times when such favour was earnestly desired. The sacrifice of innocence and purity was generally thought to be particularly acceptable among the Greeks. Children, or young virgins, were resigned by their unhappy parents, when it was supposed that the shedding of their blood would be the means of arresting the progress of pestilence, or furthering the progress of cruelty and rapine. To avert calamity at home, or to carry it abroad, was equally desirable; and human victims were loudly called for, when divine favour was invoked for either purpose. The strange illusion gave way, as reason and civilization advanced."—*Observations on the Foundation of Morals; by Eugenius:* London, 1838, pp. 37, 38.

A usage so widely spread, so revolting to human feeling, and so plainly not called for by sordid interest, could not have come into existence without some very extensive and powerful cause. If this acute author rejects the solution proposed in the page to which this note refers, can he find another equally rational? I fear that, in his just abhorrence of impostures, he confounds them with something which is no imposture; that, exploding the imitative and corrupt pretension, he renounces also any belief of a miraculous communication of truth from the Supreme Being to mankind, in the earliest ages, or in any subsequent period of time. Were but this unhappy prejudice removed, he would perhaps think that no origin of those terrible practices can be assigned, so satisfactory as that which attributes them to the *perverted* idea of a propitiation for sin revealed by divine authority. In a following page, he ranks the practice of sacrificing among "customs" which "may extend throughout vast tracts of country, and may last through long ages, without being ordained by any original principle of our nature." P. 40. Then they must have proceeded from an external source. To this author I am indebted for another passage.

"I do not believe that any nation was known, before the introduction of Christianity, who did not entertain a high respect for *sacrifice*. Barbarous and civilized people, whose customs differed in almost all other things, concurred in imagining that the favour of heaven was to be propitiated by shortening the lives of animals without profiting by their death." P, 39,

NOTE III.—page 20.

SOCINIAN VIEWS OF THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

"This way of representing the death of Christ was adapted to conciliate the prejudices of the Hebrew Christians." *Impr. Vers. of N. T. Note on Heb.* vii. 27. "Did the Jews pride themselves in their temple, their altar, their sacrifices, and their high-priest, the writer of this epistle finds in the Christian system a temple, an altar, a sacrifice, and an high-priest, superior to theirs, so that the former were only types of what followed. But as I have frequently observed, though arguments of this kind were calculated to make an impression upon Jews, they are not only of no use to us, who have no Jewish prejudices to remove, but if we be not upon our guard, they may mislead us, by teaching us to look for something more than a figurative resemblance in them." *Dr Priestley's Notes: Heb.* iv. 13. No wonder that Dr P. should have felt himself compelled to premise, that this "part of the epistle is not particularly edifying to us." The sequel of the note only shows that the writer conceived of the sentiment which he labours to explode, in a manner to which, I believe, most consistent Calvinists strongly object. May I hope that the preceding pages have shown our doctrine of redemption and satisfaction to be very different from that which is commonly imputed to us, by our theological adversaries? At the same time, it must be confessed, that some of our writers and preachers, whether ignorantly, or inadvertently, or indulging a poetical fancy, have given too much occasion for those misconceptions. It is one advantage resulting from the unpleasing toils of religious controversy, that it leads us to examine our principles more carefully, and to state them more correctly.

NOTE IV.—page 25.

ORIGIN OF SACRIFICES.

It is acknowledged that we have only circumstantial, and therefore indirect, evidence for ascribing to sacrifices the origin of a divine institution; but that this evidence amounts to a very high degree of probability, and even to a moral certainty, may, I conceive, be argued upon the following grounds.

i. *The improbability of an origin in human judgment or feeling.* We admit that the conceptions of the earliest tribes of mankind concerning THE DIVINE BEING, were tinctured with anthropomorphism;[1] and that, therefore, the idea of a present to the Author of good, as an acknowledgment of his bounty, was not unlikely to arise in the minds of men who, though in a condition of intellect and divinely communicated knowledge, widely different from the degenerate state of savage life, yet could not but be far from those purely spiritual conceptions which Christianity has diffused. But the occurrence of such an idea would naturally confine itself to the presentation of fruits and flowers. The violent death of an innocent and interesting animal, its cries, its agonies, its blood and mangled remains, could not but form a repulsive object, most distressing to the feelings, and altogether alien from the grateful ideas supposed. Nor does there appear any natural transition from the former to the latter kind of offering, but obvious sentiments of reason and feeling are opposed to such a transition.

Some have supposed that sacrifices originated in the idea of a friendly meal, and that the Deity was considered as, by this means, sitting down at table with his worshippers, and feasting with them. That this notion obtained a footing in the opinions of heathenism, is sufficiently probable; but we have no authority for attaching it to the sacrifices recorded in the earliest scriptures; and it is opposed by the fact, that the principal *sacrifice of expiation* was the holocaust, "or whole burnt offering," of which no part was eaten, but the whole consumed by the fire upon the altar.

ii. There are *rational arguments* in favour of attributing the origin of sacrifices to divine authority and injunction. I cannot set this position in a clearer light than by quoting from Dr Patrick Delany. "A plain truth, which no candid reader will, I believe, contest, is this; that *whatever practice obtains universally in the world, for any considerable number of years, must obtain in it either from some dictate of* REASON, *or some demand of* NATURE, *or some principle of* INTEREST, *or some power-*

---

[1] Evidence of this is contained in those primitive documents of history and inspiration, Noachic or possibly even antediluvian, which Moses has either incorporated into his own narrative or prefixed to it. For example; Gen. i. 8, 12, etc. the language of satisfaction at the result of an experiment, and importing a previous uncertainty;—ii. 2. repose from labour;—v. 8.—vi. 5.—viii. 1, 21.

ful influence or INJUNCTION *of some Being of universal authority.* Now, that Sacrifices obtained universally, for many ages, over all the regions of the known world, will not be denied by any man who makes the least pretence to the knowledge of antiquity. That the practice did not obtain from any dictate of *Reason*, the adversaries of revelation will, I believe, readily own; it being evident that unprejudiced reason never could antecedently dictate, that destroying the best of our fruits and creatures could be an office acceptable to God; but quite the contrary. That it did not prevail from any demand of *Nature* is undeniable; for, I believe, no man will say that we have any natural instinct or appetite to gratify, in spilling the blood of an innocent inoffensive creature upon the earth, or burning his body upon an altar. Nor could there be any temptation from appetite to do this, in those ages when the whole sacrifice was consumed by fire;[1] or when, if it were not, yet men wholly abstained from flesh:—consequently, this practice did not owe its origin to any principle of *Interest*, and so there could be no priestcraft in the case.—In after ages, the duty of sacrificing belonged to the father of the family, who was more interested in the well-being of it than any other person whatsoever, and consequently could have no interest in creating an unnecessary expense.—When fathers grew up into princes,—sacrifices were then also at the sacrificer's own expense.—Libations, and offerings of several kinds, were the constant practice of private men in their own families; and priests had no perquisites from them." [The author goes on to show the groundlessness of the pretence, that sacrificing was a rite invented by any order of men, to serve their own cupidity at the expense of others.] "Since then sacrifices are demonstrably not the invention of priestcraft, nor the dictate of reason, nor the demand of nature; I should be glad that infidels would so much as attempt to tell us, with any colour of reason and proof, how they prevailed so universally in the world, *otherwise than from* DIVINE APPOINTMENT.—How any practice could obtain in the world, to which mankind were neither urged by the *interest* and subtlety of any particular set of men, nor by any dictate of *reason*, nor by any instinct or demand of *nature*, nor by any interest of any kind; but quite the contrary, *in direct*

---

[1] All the accounts of sacrifices which we have in the Scriptures, prior to the institution of the Mosaic Law, confirm the opinion that no sacrifices were practised but holocausts.

contradiction to every principle of reason and nature and interest (for the destruction of innocent and useful creatures is so—); I say, how such a practice could prevail, and prevail universally, is impossible to be accounted for but from some powerful and irresistible influence of *example*, or injunction of AUTHORITY. And what example could have such influence except that of Adam, or what authority could have such power except that of GOD, is to me utterly inconceivable." *Revelation examined with Candour;* vol. i. p. 127–132. London, 1735.

iii. We argue from the *scripture account of the first sacrifice.* Having briefly urged this in the Discourse, I shall here adduce the corroborating statements of writers, whose acute sagacity, extensive knowledge, and likelihood of being free from what some call orthodox prejudices, entitle them to peculiar regard. I begin with the sensible author just cited: though it is worth observation that Calvin, in his comment on Gen. iv. 2, had brought forwards the same arguments.

"—Heb. xi. 4. Gen. iv. 3–7. In these words it is plainly implied that Abel acted 'well,' *i. e.* righteously, in the business of his sacrifice; and that Cain acted 'not well,' *i. e.* unrighteously, in the business of his sacrifice; and that, in consequence of this defect, 'sin lay at his door.' Now this righteousness in Abel, by which he obtained the preference to his brother, the apostle ascribes to his 'faith.' Here we see that, according to the Scripture account, the first act of *worship which God accepted* with open marks of approbation, was a *sacrifice*, in which the life of one of his creatures was devoutly offered up to him; and that what made it acceptable was the *faith* of the offerer. In this account are contained two points:—(1.) That *sacrifice* was, from the beginning, *acceptable to God;* and (2.) *That Faith made it so.*—Nothing is more absurd than to imagine that God could ever be gratified or appeased by the destruction of his creatures: and, if this action could not in its own nature be acceptable to God, how could faith make it so?—[It has been shown] that God gave Abel sure proof of his acceptance of his sacrifice, and also gave testimony of his having 'done well' in that act of adoration. Hence, I clearly infer that *sacrifices were of divine institution.* For it is certain that the destruction of an innocent creature is not, *in itself*, an action acceptable to God; and therefore nothing but *duty* could make it acceptable; and nothing but the *command of God* could make it a duty in the case before us. Nothing but God's command could create a *right* to take away the lives [of his creatures]. It is also evident that killing an innocent creature cannot, in its own nature, be properly said to be 'doing well.' And therefore, since Abel is acknowledged by God to have 'done well' in killing the firstlings of his flock in sacrifice, it is evident that he must have done this for some *very good and just reason:* and what reason could justify him in doing it but the command of God? No action is just or good otherwise than *as it is conformable to the will of God*, either revealed or established in the nature of things: [but, that such an action as this] was conformable to the divine will could only be known by *revelation*, *i. e.* by being commanded; therefore the rectitude of it could only arise from *obedience;* and obedience could justify it.—Again; the apostle assures us that 'Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by faith;' and what this faith is, he explains in some following instances.—[Noah;—Abraham;—Sarah—]. What then was this faith,—but obedience to the commands of God, and a firm trust and confidence in the assurances which HE gave them, however seemingly improbable and unlikely to be fulfilled? And can we have any doubt that Abel's faith also consisted in obedience and an assurance of being acceptable by that obedience, though in an act of duty otherwise most unlikely to be pleasing to God? [For so] that of the destruction of his innocent creatures certainly was; an action than which nothing could be, in appearance, more ill-fitted to appease the divine wrath or obtain the divine favour. And yet, a ready obedience to that great Being who commanded it, made the action and the actor righteous. It is also evident, that nothing but *such a faith* as prompted Abel to that obedience ever could make such an action acceptable to God, in any man whatsoever, from the foundation of the world." *Delany*, vol. i. p. 135–138.

"—It is easy to be demonstrated that Sacrifices owed their original to the *Will* and *Appointment* of GOD. The apostle expressly says, as Moses said before him, that Abel's sacrifice was *acceptable* to God. But it would not have been acceptable, if it had not been of divine institution; according to that plain, obvious, and eternal maxim of all true religion, Christian, Mosaic, and natural, 'In vain do they worship God, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.' Mark vii. 7. If there be any truth in this maxim, Abel would have worshipped God in vain; and God would have had no respect to his offering, if his sacrificing had been merely a commandment of his father Adam, or an invention of his own. The divine *acceptance*, therefore, is a demonstration of a divine *institution*. If any reader is not yet convinced, I would desire him to say why he does not now offer up a bullock, a sheep, or a pigeon, according to his ability, as a thank-offering to God and a testimony of his gratitude to the divine goodness, after a recovery from a dangerous disease, after a remarkable deliverance in any other kind, or as an evidence of the just apprehensions which he has of the demerit of sin. The true reason why he will not do it himself is, because he cannot know that God will accept such will-worship, and so he concludes that he should herein worship God in vain. From hence we may certainly infer that, since Abel did not sacrifice in vain, it was not will-worship, but a divine appointment." *Hallett's Continuation of Peirce on the Ep. to the Hebrews*, p. 12.

To these luminous reasonings we may add the supposition, not destitute of probability, though in an inferior degree, that the way in which "God had respect unto Abel and to his offering" (Gen. iv. 4), was by fire from heaven, that is, by a flash of lightning descending upon and kindling the faggots on the altar. The Hebrew verb denotes *to look with a rapid and keen glance of the eye*, indicating great earnestness. It may seem, therefore, to have been with some propriety that Theodotion, the Marcionite Greek translator in the second century, rendered by ἐνεπύρισεν, *he kindled*, or *set on fire*. Upon this Jerome remarks: "Unde scire poterat Cain quod fratris ejus munera suscepisset Deus et sua repudiasset, nisi illa interpretatio vera est quam Theodotio posuit? Et inflammavit Deus super Abel et super sacrificium ejus; super Cain verò et super sacrificium ejus non inflammavit." *Quæstiones Hebr. in Gen. Opera*, tom. iii. p. 379. Col. 1616. "How could Cain know that God accepted his brother's offering and rejected his own, unless the translation which Theodotion has given be the true one? And God sent down fire upon Abel and upon his sacrifice; but upon Cain and upon his sacrifice he did not send down fire." Some of the most judicious of the Jewish Rabbis hold this interpretation. Grotius sanctions it. Leclerc mentions it with approbation, and adds, "Certainly, that this phenomenon took place in the following periods of time, no one can doubt who reads Levit. ix. 24. Judges vi. 21. 1 Kings xxiii. 38. 2 Chron. vii. 1. If it was not by this particular token that Abel understood that God was propitious to him, it must have been by some other equally indubitable." *Comment. in loc.* The younger Rosenmüller gives it, without hesitation or exception, as the sense of the passage; "God accepted Abel's offering; which appears to have been manifested by fire from heaven, as took place in subsequent times."

On the other hand, J. D. Michaelis says, "I cannot but greatly doubt whether this took place by fire from heaven, which, according to a very general opinion, kindled and consumed Abel's offering. We can scarcely suppose that Moses would be silent upon such an extraordinary sign of the divine favour; at least we should act strangely, if we believed such an extraordinary thing without proof. It does not appear that the Apostle Paul had any idea of such a visible and anticipating demonstration of the divine acceptance of Abel's offering; for, in that case, the example would not have borne a perfectly happy application to its purpose, as he is treating upon faith in that which is invisible or future. I rather think, upon this point, that God had visibly blessed Abel in his pastoral occupations, and had thus shown his gracious acceptance of the thank-offering which had been brought at the end of the year; while Cain, on the contrary, had met with various kinds of misfortune in his agriculture, which would be to him a more powerful temptation to murmuring against God and envy against his brother, than a momentary flash of fire from the sky." *Erklärung des Briefes an die Hebräer;* p. 301. Frankfort, 1762. "It is usually asked, how Cain could know that God graciously regarded his brother's offering, and not his own. I answer, that it was probably from God's conferring great success the following year upon Abel's occupation in cattle, while his own field-labour turned out ill. They had both brought their offerings, to implore the blessing of God upon their respective occupations; and he who received this blessing would appear to be the person whose offering God accepted." *Uebersetzung des A. T. mit Anmerkungen für Ungelehrte*, ii. Theil, Anm. p. 25. Göttingen, 1770.

Ingenious as these remarks are, I conceive that a just reply may be given to them. Certainly there is no objection to the idea that even a considerable time might elapse, between the offerings and Cain's murderous revenge; and there might be an observable difference of the divine providence towards the righteous brother and the wicked one. But all this forms no objection to the supposition of the miraculous enkindling. The argument of the apostle upon Abel's faith refers to his state of mind previously to the sacrifice, and is, therefore, in no respect prejudiced by any opinion upon the way in which God testified his approbation. Neither can we draw an adverse conclusion from the silence of Moses. Both he and the other scriptural historians omit the definite mention of circumstances innumerable and important, but the occurrence of which is beyond a doubt implied. Besides there is much weight in Delany's observations: "The Jews knew very well that their own sacrifices were of divine institution, and that God manifested his acceptance of them, upon the first solemn oblation after that institution, by miraculous fire from the divine presence (Lev. ix. 24); and they could have no reason to doubt that they were so instituted and so accepted from the beginning: nor needed they to be then informed of a truth which, doubtless, a clear uninterrupted tradition had long made familiar to them." *Rev. Exam.* i. 140.

iv. We have evidence of the practice of animal sacrificing, as the most solemn act of worship, by the patriarchs to whom divine communications were habitually made. Noah, the second common ancestor of our race, on the greatest and most affecting occasion, offered that kind of sacrifice which possessed the highest weight and dignity, as denoting both expiation and gratitude. Gen. viii. 20. The passage peculiarly dwells upon its acceptableness to God: and this could not have been without a knowledge of its divine appointment. The reference to the offering of sacrifices in the histories of Abraham and Jacob, plainly indicate that it was the known and accredited method of honouring the Deity, and of procuring expiation for sin. The expiatory design of sacrifices, and the divine approbation of them with that view, could not be more plainly expressed than in the Book of Job, ch. i. 5. xlii. 8. In all these instances, confidence in the acceptance of God is clearly implied: but such confidence could not have existed without a divine warrant, and a divine warrant either is a divine institution or presupposes one. Universal knowledge and tradition, concerning the original divine institution, sufficiently account for the occurrence of no specific mention of it in the brief records of the antediluvian and patriarchal history.

The late Mr Mitford conceived that the rite of sacrificing was prescribed by the merciful Jehovah to our first parents, upon their fall, in order to teach them the preparation of animal flesh for food, and to overcome the repugnance which they could not but feel at such a new and revolting mode of sustaining their own lives. Referring to Gen. iv. 4, he says, "Sacrifice without any previous notice of such a rite, is mentioned in clear terms and as an established duty of man, and as the means still graciously afforded by the Creator of immediate communication with himself.—It seems to me enough implied that, with the institution of the rite of sacrifice, the grant, in a following part of Scripture distinctly stated, of every inferior animal as lawful food for man, was made to Adam on his removal from paradise.—The rite of burnt-offering was to hallow the meal of meat ensuing; for it is abundantly marked in Scripture and by heathen writers, that the sacrifice among both Jews and Gentiles always afforded a meal." Thus the learned author supposed that the Deity introduced man to a kind of food which his altered circumstances now rendered necessary, but which must have appeared "disgusting both in preparation and use:" and that also some religious benefit was intended; for, by duly attending to this painful and humiliating process, and its obvious suggestions of moral instruction, man would make use of "this very rite of burnt-offering, with all its degrading circumstances, for the exercise of his high moral privilege, peculiar to himself among surrounding animals, of communicating with his Creator." *Observations on the History and Doctrine of Christianity, by the late William Mitford, Esq.*, the author of the History of Greece; pp. 48–51, quoted in the *Monthly Repos. New Series*, vol. i. p. 214. 1827. I submit these remarks.

1. The language of Scripture is decidedly in favour of the commonly received opinion, that the permission of animal food was not given by the Lord of all, till after the deluge. Compare Gen. i. 21, with ix. 3. If mankind had been directed to kill animals for food, immediately upon the fall, it would have appeared like giving a reward for disobedience, as the previous donation remained in full force, of suitable fruits and herbs, in all their variety, and as a short time would suffice for overcoming the repugnance, and producing proofs of the agreeableness and salubrity of animal food duly prepared. Besides, as Michaelis observes, had men used such food from the first, when as yet the serviceable animals had not sufficiently multiplied their numbers, there would have been danger of an extir-

pation of some of the most valuable species. It might be replied that a very few years would be sufficient to provide against that danger: but this concession would not help Mr Mitford's conjecture, which is that animal food was granted by God immediately upon the entrance of sin and misery into the world.

2. The hypothesis involves the principal fact, that sacrifices were not a human invention but an express institution of God.

3. It also admits that they had an instructive and religious object. They were not solely to sanction and recommend animal food, but, by the distressing and "degrading circumstances" with which its procurement was attended, to promote humiliation and repentance, and to be a means of mercy and grace in the communion of man with his Creator; that is, as undoubtedly Mr Mitford meant, by acts of spiritual devotion.

4. The learned author is greatly in error when he says that, "amongst both Jews and Gentiles, the sacrifice always afforded a meal." The עֹלָה, commonly rendered *burnt offering*, in the LXX. *ὁλοκαύτωμα*, was a very frequent kind of sacrifice under the Hebrew law, and probably *the most frequent* in earlier times; and it was *entirely consumed* by fire upon the altar. It is the word used in the history of the earliest recorded sacrifices, after that of Abel; namely, in the instances of Noah, Gen. viii. 20; Abraham, xx. 7, 8, 13; and Job, ch. i. 5; and, in the ceremonial precepts of Moses, the examples are extremely numerous indeed. See particularly Lev. i. 1–13, where it is plain that *this* was the great and chief kind of sacrifice. The general term מִנְחָה, used concerning the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, merely denotes *a present*, and is used in application to every kind of sacrifice; so that we cannot from it conclude that Abel's offering was not a whole burnt offering. With regard to the Gentiles, Mr Mitford's assertion is equally inaccurate. It is surprising that he who had read so much Greek, should not have recollected the passage in Hesiod (*Theogonia*, v. 521–560), which represents Prometheus as having offended Jupiter by innovating upon the practice of offering the whole animal, and by reserving the best parts of it for food. See also Hyginus, in his *Astron. Poet.* ii. 15, and *Saubertus de Sacrificiis Veterum*, p. 430.

5. If we were to admit all that Mr Mitford asserts, it would by no means militate against our sentiment; but would indeed give additional establishment to it. He affirms the divine institution of sacrifice, and that religious lessons were repre-

sented by it: then why should not those lessons have included the idea of mercy and pardon for the offences of the offerer, in some way which the awful sight of a violent death was adapted to represent? The circumstance of partaking of the offering, by food, would strengthen rather than militate against this idea; for it would suggest that, as the eating of a part of the slain victim sustained this transient life, so the benefits of a restored, spiritual, and eternal life, were to be obtained by sinning mortals, through the means of something far more excellent, but yet analogous to the visible sacrifice.

NOTE V.—page 25.

SKINS OF ANIMALS CONVERTED INTO CLOTHING.

"We have here probably a Divine Institution of Sacrifices. At least sacrifices were soon afterwards brought by Cain and Abel: and the essence of sacrifices consisted in this, that the punishment which the sinner had merited, and which was now to him remitted or respited, was displayed to him in an animal." *Michaelis Anmerk. zu Gen.* iii. 21.

"Since this exigency [clothing] would likewise be fully answered by sacrifices, which would yield them covering from the skins of the creatures so slain; this is also a new evidence of the wisdom of God in this institution. Nor is there the least reason to doubt that the clothes made for our first parents, by divine appointment, immediately after the fall, were of the skins of the creatures offered up to God on this occasion; for there is no reason to imagine that any of the beasts, which were just made in perfection, should die so soon, or would naturally die in many years after their creation. What could show the evil of disobedience more strongly, than the groans and struggles of innocent creatures, bleeding to death for his guilt, before his eyes and by his own hands? Sights of this kind are shocking to humanity even yet, though custom hath long made them familiar. With what horror, then, may we imagine they pierced the hearts of our first parents! And how was this horror aggravated, when they considered themselves as the guilty authors of so much cruelty to the beings about them!—And, when the groans and struggles of the dying animals were over, what ghastly and sad sights must the dead eyes and cold carcases of the creatures yield him, before they were placed upon the altar; and in their ashes after! How dismal a meditation must it be, to consider the beauty and excellence of animated beings, reduced to a handful of dust!—Is it possible to conceive how God could strike the human soul with more sense of misery from guilt, or more abhorrence of the sad cause of that misery, than by this conduct? Such abhorrence of guilt, and such a loathing of life, that, if the mercy of God had not caused some ray of hope to shine through this scene of mortality and misery, it is not to be imagined how Adam and Eve could bear their being: and therefore there seems to be an absolute necessity that, when sacrifices pierced the heart of man with such dread, and detestation of guilt and misery, they should at the same time be seals to some covenant of mercy from God. That God entered into a covenant of mercy with man, immediately after the fall, is evident from the sentence passed upon the serpent, in which a covenant of mercy is necessarily implied. And can we doubt that sacrifices were the seal of that covenant? Especially when mercy is so plainly implied in the very nature of the institution, which teaches that, though life be the forfeiture of sin, yet God will in mercy accept another life in lieu of the offender's."—*Delany*, i. 148-150.

NOTE VI.—page 25.

HEATHEN NOTIONS OF THE INTENTION OF SACRIFICES.

That the Greeks and Romans, and other ancient nations of whose religion any sufficient notices have descended to us, believed in the propitiatory effect of sacrifices, is so familiar a fact to all who are conversant with ancient authors, that an induction of instances is as unnecessary, as it would be almost endless. Herodotus tells us (*Euterpe*, § 39), that the Egyptians believed that the public or private calamities which might be impending, were averted by being "turned upon the head" of the sacrificed victim. Homer and the Greek Tragedians are the most complete authorities for the religious views of their respective times; and that they considered sacrifices to be efficacious to placate the gods and procure the pardon of offences, is abundantly manifest. Dr Magee, in several of his learned and excellent Dissertations, has produced many evidences of the prevalence of this sentiment, among both ancient and modern heathen nations. But he has by no means exhausted the subject. Testimonies innumerable might be added to those which his extensive reading has collected. Many are to be found, accompanied with valuable reasonings and criticisms, in the last Chapter of Grotius *de Satisf. Christi.* The well known passage in Cæsar's account of the Gaulish tribes, including all the ancient Britons, most plainly declares the belief in a *propitiatory effect* of their numerous immolations of human victims. See *De Bello Gallico*, vi. 16. Some very interesting examples occur in Livy. Horatius, the survivor of the brothers in the combat of the Horatii and Curatii, was saved by popular acclamation from the death which he had incurred by killing his sister: but it was held necessary that his father should provide an expiation by sacrifices, at the public expense. *Ut cædes manifesta aliquo tamen piaculo lueretur, imperatum patri ut filium expiaret pecunia publica: is, quibusdam piacularibus sacrificiis factis,—etc. Lib.* i. 26. When the elder Decius devoted himself to death for the supposed salvation of his country, he was regarded "as sent by heaven to be an expiation to the wrath of the gods:"—*sicut cælo missus piaculum omnis deorum iræ.* viii. 9. His son, in another public danger, followed his example, exclaiming that "it was granted to their family to be expiations to remove the perils of the state!" x. 28. In similar language is described the intention of Postumius, after the surrender at the Furcæ Caudinæ. ix. 10. Fabius Maximus attributed the successes of Hannibal to the wrath of the gods for his country's crimes, and began his dictatorship by a solemn inquiry what expiations could appease that wrath. xxii. 9. So Scipio pronounces the mutiny of his army to be a crime which "no sacrifices, no supplications, could expiate, but the blood of the offenders." xxviii. 27. So the violation of the sacred treasury at Locri, was held to require an expiatory sacrifice; and the college of priests was to determine what expiations were requisite, to what deities, and with what victims. xxix. 19. Other examples are furnished by the same charming and instructive author. Were one thus to go through all the Greek and Roman historians, the instances would swell to a vast collection: and the earlier are the times to which they belong, the more abundant and striking they are. Thus, in the earliest ages of mankind, while the impressions of primitive tradition, though so lamentably misapplied, and associated with the characteristic ferocity of polytheism, were not yet abraded by philosophy and civilization,—thus strongly and universally did men recognize that their crimes insured the vengeance of superior powers, except its course was stayed by the atonement of sacrifices, often in a high degree difficult, costly, and terrific. As amidst the errors of idolatry, it is easy to perceive the indelible effects of the primitive belief and worship of the Only God: so, under this mass of corruption, we obviously see the foundation of original truth.

The name of the month February is derived from an old Roman word, *Februa:* which was a general term for sacrifices and ceremonies performed at the close of the year, for the expiation of all the sins of the expiring period. February was the last month in the ancient Roman year, in which it was "held an essential part of filial duty, to make atonement on the behalf of our parents, by a sacrifice of the greatest value." *Cicero de Legibus*, ii. 21. See the curious information of Ovid on the early religion of the Romans; *Fasti*, ii. 20–50, where among other interesting particulars, he says, "The fathers of the Roman state called expiations *Februa*:—In fine, whatever is a mean of atonement for our souls (*quo pectora nostra piamur*), our unpolished ancestors called by this name:—Such expiations they believed would take away every sin and every cause of calamity." To the same effect the following remarkable passage is produced by Grotius from Pliny; [At vereor ne virum summum memoria fefellerit, mihi enim utriusque Plinii libros diligenter evolventi, loci hujus inveniendi causa, labor male cessit:] "From early times the ancient opinion has prevailed, that all observances were (*februa*) expiations, by which the consciences of sinners could be purged, and their sins blotted out (*conscientiæ purgarentur, delerenturque peccata*)." *Ap. Grot. de Satisf.* cap. x.

A recent work of the Marquis de Puysegur contains this striking passage: "Not knowing how man had offended God, the method which appeared to them [mankind in the early ages] the most proper and just for appeasing the Deity, was to shed the blood of the offender, and that the purest blood; for their sacrifices were almost always children, and those the children of the first families. All nations, without exception, have had their share in these terrible mysteries. In spite of the horror with which those practices fill us, in our state of cultivation, we cannot but perceive that they were consistent with the convictions of their performers.—The idea that man could be saved in no other way than by the substitution of a victim, was as universal as the idea itself of a God; and indeed more universal than that of mere prayer, for travellers have discovered tribes whose rites presented no appearance of prayer in words, but they prayed by action, by the sacrificing of their victims." *De l Action Divine dans les Evénemens Humains;* Paris, 1840; cited in the *Sémeur*, Aug. 12.

NOTE VII.—page 26.

PYTHAGOREANS, ETC.

"Pythagoricorum factio hanc cum Deo unionem fieri posse statuit per purgationem animæ et corporis; hanc vero purgationem alii ex iis διὰ τῶν θυσιῶν καὶ τοῦ θυηπολικοῦ πυρὸς peragi posse sciscunt, quales Jamblichus, Syrianus, et Proclus; alii vero per philosophiam," etc. *Brunneri Diss. de Theol. Nat.* "The sect of the Pythagoreans maintained that this union with God was to be attained by the purification of both mind and body: but this purification some of them conceived might be wrought out by sacrifices and the sacrificial fire, as Jamblichus, Syrianus, and Proclus; but others regarded the doctrines of their philosophy as sufficient to answer this purpose." Those of the disciples of Pythagoras who rejected animal sacrifices, as they did animal food, supported their practice entirely by arguments from humanity and reason, while they yielded the claim of antiquity. Porphyry, in his ingenious Treatise on Abstinence from Animals, sets up the hypothesis that men first offered the fruits of the earth, then *each other*, and lastly, the usual animals. *Lib.* ii. 27. He scarcely attempts a reply to the argument in defence of sacrifices, which he cites from Claudius Neapolitanus; that they were founded on immemorial custom and law, "not from the authority of men, but according to the appointment of God." *Lib.* i. 25. A fragment of an uncertain author in Photius affirms, that the Pythagoreans "abstained from animals, and tasted, at the proper season, of *the sacrifices only*." *Biblioth. ed. Hoeschel.* 1612, p. 1313. As for Zaleucus (who was a Pythagorean), Plato, and the elder Platonists, it is very plain, that their objection was not to sacrifices, but to the notion of their sufficiency without a pious mind and personal virtue. See the noble preface to the Laws of Zaleucus, in *Diodorus Siculus*, xii. 20, and the celebrated passage of Plato in the *Alcibiades Secundus*, § 12, 13.

NOTE VIII.—page 31.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION BY THE LEVITES.

The opinion here advanced may seem inconsistent with that of Michaelis. He regards the Levites as not merely an order of men set apart for the duties of the sanctuary, but as the general body of persons professing learning in all the faculties; ministers of religion, judges or rather expounders of the law, copyists and guardians of the sacred books, keepers of the genealogical registers, and superintendents of the national standards of weights and measures: and he goes on to say, "We nowhere find that Moses mentions, even incidentally, any such profession as that of our clergyman, or that he instituted preaching on the Sabbath. The Levites cannot be justly compared with our preachers. This class of men, whose importance in a political point of view alone must be acknowledged, if they did nothing else than instruct the common people in morality, was wanting in the constitution of the Mosaic state and church. So, likewise, the priests of the gods in other nations were occupied, not in instruction, but in sacrifices and ceremonies. A body of teachers of religion, properly so called, did not exist among the Jews until after the Babylonish captivity; when the pressing emergencies of the church required its establishment. The Levites were so far the ministers of religion as that they performed holy ceremonies, copied the law, and in doubtful cases explained it. To them the original of the law was committed (Deut. xxxi. 9); they were to be its guardians, and to take care to make correct transcripts of it.—The king had to take his copy of the law from theirs (Deut. xvii. 18). They were bound, at the end of every seven years, to read over the law in the hearing of all the people (Deut. xxxi. 10–13); and even to be so conversant in it that they could, at least when questioned, give instructions concerning religion." *Mosaic Law, Article* lii. *Dr Alex. Smith's Translation;* vol. i. p. 254–257.

But I conceive that there is no real opposition, in what I have advanced, to the statements of this eminent biblicist. It is not supposed that the Levites, or any part of their body, formed an ecclesiastical council for the decision of controversies purely religious; or that they, or any of them not specially called by God to the prophetic office, assumed infallibility to their declarations. It was a different thing (as Michaelis very justly argues in his Annotation on Deut. xvii. 10), that, as a court of law, they formed a tribunal of the last resort, and from whose decisions no appeal lay. Such a supreme court is necessary in every nation, otherwise litigations would never end. The religious law of the Israelites was indeed intermingled with the political: but we are speaking, not of questions of practice, but of those regarding doctrine and elucidation, and are maintaining that the Levites had it in charge to explain religious subjects, not as dictators, but as well-informed and faithful men, each according to the measure of his knowledge and ability. Michaelis admits that the Levites *explained* the law, as well as read it publicly to the people, and were qualified to *give instructions* concerning religion.

A brief and perspicuous description of the different KINDS of the SACRIFICES and OFFERINGS prescribed in the Mosaic Law will be of general use in the reading of the Scriptures, and will cast much light upon the arguments in the preceding Discourses. I therefore select the following, from the (*Biblisches Realwörterbuch, u. s. w.*) *Bible Dictionary of Persons, Things, and Facts; for the Use of Students, Candidates for the Ministry, Teachers of Academic Youth, and Clergymen; by George Benedict Winer, D.D., and Prof. Theol. in the University of Leipzig*, 2 vols. 1820, a work rich in information; but, I lament to say, deeply impregnated with the venom of the anti-supernatural Neologism.[1] The reader will be candid enough to observe, that I do not pledge myself to the approval of every particular assertion and implication in these extracts, though I regard them as generally true and correct. Dr Winer is the author of another very useful biblical work, which has been translated into our own language, improved, and published by the excellent and learned Professor Moses Stuart, of Andover, North America: "A Grammar of the New Testament Greek Idiom."

---

[1] This classification will be confirmed and illustrated by comparison with the correspondent parts of a work of great value for the understanding of the Israelitish religion and antiquities, the *Pictorial History of Palestine*, especially Book II. chap. v., by John Kitto, D.D. Lond. 1840.

"Among the Hebrews, as among all nations of the ancient world, Sacrifices formed the most essential part of the worship of God.

"The Mosaic institutions concerning Offerings and Sacrifices, are comprised in the following particulars.

I. "The Objects, or things offered, were taken from both the Vegetable and the Animal kingdom. They were therefore distinguished into the *Unbloody* Offerings (מִנְחוֹת προσφοραὶ), and the *Bloody* (זְבָחִים slain sacrifices, θυσίαι). With both of these, one article out of the Mineral kingdom, *Salt*, was used.

"The *Vegetable* substances used for offerings were both of the *solid* and of the *liquid* kind. Of the former description were flour, cakes, parched or roasted corn, and frankincense: these formed the *meat-offering*, or *mincha* strictly so called. Of the latter kind was the *drink-offering* (נֶסֶךְ σπονδή see Philip. ii. 17), consisting of wine,—either *natural*, the juice of grapes simply expressed; or *artificial*, fermented and clarified. According to Josephus (*Antiq.* iii. 9, and compare the *Wisdom of Jesus*, l. 15), it was poured out all round the altar, and not, as the Jews say, into a peculiar channel or pipe connected with the altar. The drink-offerings were usually united with meat-offerings, and both considered as an addition to the thank-offerings made by fire, but not sin-offerings or trespass-offerings, Num. xv. 5–11. xxviii. 7–15. Lev. xiv. 10–21. A very close similarity existed with the *Libations* of the heathen nations of antiquity. *Iliad* i. 462. *Æneid.* vi. 254. The heathen drink-offerings consisted of wine mingled with blood (*vinum assiratum; Sallust. Catil.* § 32. *Silius Ital.* ii. 360), mentioned in Ps. xvi. 4. Zech. ix. 7.

"The *Animals* used in sacrifice were oxen, goats, and sheep: in some cases also turtle-doves and young doves of either sex. All were to be *without blemish:* and, except doves, not under eight days, nor over three years old. Ex. xxii. 20. xii. 5. Lev. ix. 3. Compare the *Iliad* vi. 93. vii. 314. x. 292. *Odyss.* xix. 420. No fishes were ever offered. Human sacrifices were strictly forbidden. Lev. xviii. 21. xx. 2–5.

II. "The Place, in which alone offerings could be presented, was the front-court of the National Sanctuary; first, the tabernacle, and afterwards the temple. Lev. xvii. 1–9. Deut. xii. 5–7. Probably the design of this provision was to prevent the possibility of idolatrous rites being practised in private, under the mask of the legal ritual. Yet there are not a few instances of sacrifices offered elsewhere, without any reprehension; and even by prophets themselves. Judges ii. 5. 1 Sam. vii. 17. ix. 12. 1 Kings xviii. 19, 32.

III. "The View with which offerings were brought, was either to express *gratitude* to God for favours received, or to make *expiation* for sins committed. To this belongs the distinction between thank-offerings or sacrifices of praise, and sin-offerings or trespass-offerings.

IV. "In the Performance of the sacrifice, the person whose property it was, he being himself first legally purified and sanctified (1 Sam. xvi. 5. comp. Ex. xix. 14), brought the animal-victim to the altar, at the same time turned himself so as to have his face towards the door of the sanctuary (הִקְרִיב Lev. ii. 3, 4. iii. 1. xvii. 4), and laid his hand upon the head of the animal (Lev. i. 4. iii. 2. iv. 33), the last act to signify, that the punishment due to him should fall upon the victim. Then he slew it (Lev. i. 5), which, however, the priest also might do, and in later times actually did (2 Chron. xxix. 24. Ezra vi. 24). In the act of slaying, the priest received the blood in brazen bowls (מִזְרָק), and sprinkled or poured it near the different offerings, yet apart from them. The offerer then took the skin of the victim, and cut it into pieces (Lev. i. 6, and perhaps 2 Chron. xxix. 34, refers to this part of the ceremony). The burning of the proper parts of the sacrifice (namely, the omentum, the fat covering the intestines, the fat of the intestines, the kidneys, the lobes of the liver, and in sheep the fat of the tail) was attended to by the priest. In some sacrifices, before or after the slaying, the *heaving* or lifting up (תְּרוּמָה) and the *waving* (תְּנוּפָה) were usual. The latter consisted in a moving to and fro of the victim, on all sides and towards all the quarters of the heavens; and the former consisted in its being lifted up high towards heaven (*Gemara, Kiddush*, xxxvi. 2. *Succa*, xxxvii. 2). Both were a manifest symbol of *presentation* to Jehovah, the Lord of heaven and of the whole earth; perhaps similar to the *porricere* of the Romans: *Macrobii Saturnalia*, iii. 2. Michaelis (*Suppl. ad Lex. Hebr.* 1615), on Num. viii. 6, maintains that תְּנוּפָה signifies *the laying of the consecrated thing before the Lord and before the altar:* against which notion see *Bauer's Description of the Ordinances of Divine Worship among the Ancient Hebrews;* vol. i. p. 137. Jahn is of opinion that the *heave-offering* and the *wave-offering* denoted precisely the same thing, and that sometimes the one and sometimes the other rite is expressly mentioned, since both were always united and had the same symbolical reference (see his *Introd. to the O. T.* vol. iii. p. 373). But the following passages prevent our coinciding with this opinion. Ex. xxxviii. 24, comp. Num. xxxi. 52. Ex. xxix. 24, 27, 28, comp. Lev. ix. 21. On the whole subject see *I. G. Carpzovii Appar. Hist. Crit. Antiq. Sacr.* p. 699. *Outram. de Sacrif. Relandi Antiq. Hebr.* iii. 1. *Bauer*, i. 80. *Jahn* iii. 395. *Kaiser's Bible Theol.* ii. 119. *Michaelis on the Mosaic Law*, iv. 48. *Rosenmülleri Excurs. in Schol. ad Levit.*"

V. The various kinds of sacrifice.

i. "Burnt-offering (עֹלָה, Chald. עֲלָתָא, כָּלִיל, Chald. גְּמִירָא; LXX. ὁλοκάρπωσις, κάρπωμα, ὁλοκαύτωμα, Matt. xii. 33; Philo; ὁλόκαυστον· Gen. xxii. 13. Job i. 8), was the most distinguished of all the sacrifices, and consisted in the immolating of a *male animal victim* (comp. *Josephi Antiq. Jud.* iii. 10; and 1 Sam. vi. 14), which was sometimes a bull of three years old, sometimes a sheep or goat of one year old, more rarely a young dove or turtle-dove. It was always consumed entirely in the fire. ('Holocaustum est, quod totum offertur Deo, et sacro igne consumitur.' *Hieron. ad Ezech.* xlv.) The sacrifice was slain on the north side of the altar, deprived of the skin—(the skin belonged to the priests, Lev. vii. 8. 'The law ordains that the priests, who minister in the sacrifices, should take the hides, a perquisite not a little, but rich in a high degree.' *Philo de Sacerd. Honor.* p. 833, ed. 1640)—and cut up into the proper pieces by the offerer himself. The priest received the blood in a bowl, sprinkled it around the altar, and then laid all the parts of the victim separately upon the fire, which it was his duty to keep always burning. Of doves, the priest was to nip off the head with his finger nails, squeeze out the blood on the edge of the altar, pluck off the feathers, and throw them with the crop into the ash-pit, divide it down to the wings, and then completely burn it. See Levit. i. 1–17. vi. 1–6.

"The Design of the burnt-offerings was to make atonement with God for sins committed, in general (Lev. i. 4), and they were presented, partly, in the name of the whole nation, daily, every morning and evening (Ex. xxix. 38–42. Num. vii. 15–17, etc. viii. 12. xxviii.), as also in connexion with a sin-offering on the great day of atonement (Lev. xvi. 3), and on the three principal anniversary festivals; partly, in the solemnities of consecration to office (Lev. viii. 18–29. ix. 2–4. Num. viii. 8), and partly, by private persons, in order to be freed from the condition of Levitical uncleanness; namely, by women after childbearing, at the end of the legally prescribed period for the purification (Lev. xii. 6–8), by lepers when cured (Lev. xiv. 21, 31), by Nazarites, when they had touched a dead body (Num. vi. 11–14), and by those referred to in Lev. xv. 1–15. Persons who brought only two doves for a sin-offering, were obliged to make one of them a burnt-offering; Lev. v. 10. In later times, even heathens sometimes presented this kind of offering: in particular, the Emperor Augustus directed to be offered for himself a daily sacrifice of two lambs and a bull. (*Philo*, *in Leg. ad Caium; Joseph. Bell. Jud.* ii. 17.) Hecatombs of burnt-offerings are mentioned in Ezra vi. 17. 1 Chron. xxix. 21. 2 Chron. xxix. 32. Comp. *Odyssey*, iii. 6–9. *Ovid. Trist.* ii. 1, 75."

ii. "TRESPASS-OFFERING and SIN-OFFERING (*sacrificia piacularia*), among the Hebrews, were sacrifices offered for such transgressions as were not punished by the laws of the state, or which were only known to the conscience of the individual. The trespass-offering was called *asham* (אָשָׁם), and the sin-offering *hattath* (חַטָּאת); and they were actually distinguished, both in the prescriptions of the law itself (Lev. vii. 1–10, of trespass-offerings; and iv. 6, 25–30 of sin-offerings), which enumerate, with minute care, the circumstances under which each of the two was to be brought; and in other passages; *e.g.* Num. vi. 12; comp. 14. Lev. xiv. 12; comp. 19, etc.

"*Trespass-offerings* were brought in the following cases:

"1. When a person did not inform of a crime committed by another, he having been privy to it, and being legally required to give information.

"2. When a person had touched any unclean object, and discovered it too late, so that he had not brought the sacrifice of purification.

"3. When a person had rashly sworn that he would do a particular thing, and then, through forgetfulness, neglected to do it, but thought of it afterwards when too late.

"4. When a person had, through mistake, applied to a common purpose anything which had been consecrated to a holy use.

"5. When a person had refused to give up what had been committed to his trust, or violated an engagement, or denied stolen property which had come into his hands, or concealed and forsworn any lost thing which he had found.

"6. When any person had, through ignorance, done something forbidden, and became afterwards apprised of it.

"7. When a man had criminal connexion with a betrothed female slave, who was not redeemed, nor had in any other way obtained her freedom. Lev. xix. 20–22. To this may be added the contracting of idolatrous marriages: see Ezra x. 19.

"Besides these, a Nazarite, who had contracted defilement by touching a dead body (Num. vi. 9–12), and a leper who had been cured (Lev. xiv. 12, 24), were to bring a trespass-offering.

"The object sacrificed in this kind of offering was different on different occasions. In cases 1, 2, and 3, it was a ewe or a she-goat; or, if the sacrificer were poor, it might consist of doves or fine flour without oil and incense. In cases 4 and 5, it was a ram without blemish; besides which the guilty person was to restore the alienated property and add to it one-fifth of the value; in case 4, to the priest, in case 5, to the owner or his heirs, or if he had died without heirs, to the priest. In cases 6 and 7, the victim was a ram. The Nazarite and healed leper offered a lamb. The victim was always slain on the north side of the altar, the blood sprinkled round it, and the pieces of fat burned upon it.

"*Sin-offerings* were of two kinds, the *greater* and the *less*.

"(i.) The *greater*, which were offered in the following cases:

"1. When the high-priest had committed an offence, and thereby had brought guilt upon the whole nation.

"2. When the whole nation had committed an offence, through ignorance, and afterwards repented.

"3. On the great day of atonement, for the high-priest and the nation.

"In the first of these cases, the victim consisted of a young bull, on whose head the high-priest laid his hand and acknowledged his sin. Then he slew the animal on the north side of the altar, spurted the blood with his finger in the holy place of the temple seven times towards the veil or curtain which separated it from the most holy place, besprinkled the altar of incense, and poured out what remained upon the ground in the court before the altar of burnt-offering. Only the fat and the usual abdominal pieces were burned upon the altar; all the rest was burned without the gates of the city.

"In the second case, the people offered likewise a young bull; the elders laid their hands upon its head, and it was then sacrificed as in the preceding case.

"The third respected *the great day of* ATONEMENT. This was the only public fast-day ordained in the Mosaic law. It was celebrated annually on the 10th day (*i. e.* from the evening of the 9th to the evening of the 10th) of the seventh month, Tisri, five days before the feast of Tabernacles. It was observed with solemnity equal to that of the Sabbath. (Lev. xvi. 1–34. xxiii. 26–32. Num. xxix. 7–11.) The high-priest performed the service of the sacrifice, principally by himself. After he had purified himself by bathing the whole body, and had dressed himself in the appropriate white linen garments, he slew a young bull as a sin-offering for himself and his family, went into the most holy place, there kindled with coals from the altar a composition of perfumes, so that the lid of the ark of the covenant (which was regarded as the seat of the present Deity) was entirely covered with the cloud of smoke, sprinkled some of the blood with his finger towards the forepart of the lid of the ark and seven times upon the ground, and in his returning through the holy place he smeared some of the blood upon the four corners ('the horns') of the altar of incense. Then he brought forth two goats as the sin-offering for the whole nation; but of these, only one, that upon which the lot 'for Jehovah' fell, was actually slain, and with its blood the same ceremonies were repeated that had been performed with that of the young bull. The other, upon which the lot 'for Azazel' had fallen, after the high-priest had laid his hands upon it, and had confessed all the sins of the people, was taken, by a person appointed for that purpose, to a desert place, and there set at liberty. Then the high-priest bathed himself again, put on his rich official dress, and brought forth two rams and seven yearling lambs (Num. xxix. 9), as a burnt-sacrifice for himself and the nation, and burned upon the altar the usual portions of fat of those sin-offerings. All the remains of the victims he directed to be carried out of the camp, or the city, and there to be burned. (See *Marckii Diss. Phil. Theol.* 146. *Dassov. de Ingressu Summi Pontif. in Sanct. Sanctorum. Danz. in Menschen. N. Test. Talm.* 921. *Deyling. Obs.*

Sacr. 177. *Kirchmeier de Sacerd. Summi Ingr. Overcamp. de eod. arg.*)

"The following remarks are added, for the elucidation of some particulars.

"(1.) The Ceremonial of this sacred solemnity is very explicitly detailed by the Talmudical writings; but it is not easy to determine with certainty how much of their descriptions was actually practised. Josephus gives but little information on these points.[1] In the relation which he gives, it will be at once perceived that much of the scriptural statement is omitted; for example, the changing of the high-priest's dress, and the burning of perfumes, upon which so much stress appears to be laid in the passages above cited from the book of Leviticus; much also is more closely defined; as, in particular, it would appear, from the words 'he takes into the temple some of the blood,' etc., that the high-priest carried the blood of both the sin-offerings at the same time into the most holy place; which is not quite clear from the passages in Leviticus.

"The substance of what the Talmudists say upon this subject is as follows.

"[1.] That, in addition to the peculiar observances of the day of atonement, the high-priest had to perform the ordinary service of a sabbath; such as the lighting of the lamps, the presentation of the morning and evening sacrifice, etc. of which nothing occurs in the Bible or in Josephus, but which is certainly not improbable.

"[2.] That he went *four* times into the most holy place: first, with the sacred perfume, during which time a priest was shaking the blood of the bull, that it might not coagulate; the second time, with the blood of the bull; the third, with that of the goat; and the fourth time, to fetch out the censer of incense. Of all this the Bible and Josephus say nothing, and Philo directly contradicts the assertion.[1]

---

[1] "On the 10th day of the same month, reckoning by the moon, they fast till the evening. On this day they sacrifice a bull, two rams, seven lambs, and a kid as a sin-offering. To these they add also two kids; of which one is conveyed to the desert beyond the boundaries of the country, to be an *Averting* and *Deprecation* for the whole people, on account of their sins; and the other they take to the cleanest of the places adjoining to the city, and there they burn it with its skin, without using any ceremonies of purification. A bull is likewise burned in the same manner, provided, not by the people, but by the high-priest at his own expense. When it is slain, he takes into the temple some both of its blood and of the kid's, and sprinkles it seven times with his finger on the covering [of the ark], and the same on the pavement: this also he repeats, an equal number of times in the body of the temple and around the golden altar; and he carries the rest into the open air, and sprinkles it round the greater altar. In addition to these, they lay [to be burned] upon the altar the [ἐξοχαὶ] horns and legs, the kidneys, and the fat, with the lobe of the liver. The high-priest also presents a ram as a whole burnt-sacrifice to God." *Josephi Antiq. Jud.* III. x. 3.

"[3.] That, at the third time of his staying in the temple, as soon as he had returned into the holy place, he sprinkled eight times the blood of the bull and afterwards of the goat towards the veil, then poured together the two bloods and therewith smeared the horns of the altar of incense and a part of its surface; and at last poured the rest of the blood at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering.

"[4.] They add a fable about a purple bandage, a part of which was tied to the goat that was sent away.—(*Mischna, Surenhusii*, II. 206. *Joma*, vi. 8. *Schabba*, ix. 3. *Tertullian. adv. Jud.* iii. 3. *Maimonid. in Crenii Opuscul.* vii. 651, 819. On the seven days' preparation of the high-priest for this solemn day, see *Relandi. Antiq. Hebr.* iv. 6, 5. *Carpzov. Apparat.* p. 434.)

"(2.) The signification of the word AZAZEL (עֲזָאזֵל) has been the subject of much controversy, and we can scarcely expect it to be brought to a satisfactory determination. Some understand by this term the *place* to which the goat was to be driven, a rugged valley which, according to Eben Ezra, was not far from Sinai: this is the opinion of Jonathan [the Targumist] and many of the rabbis, and among the moderns, Vatablus; and it corresponds to the Arabic *jil azaz, a rugged mountain*, and the Greek σκληροβάτης.—Others maintain that Azazel was the name given to the goat itself; so the LXX. ἀποπομπαῖος· Symmachus, ἀπερχόμενος· the Vulgate, *hircus emissarius;* [the authorized English Version, *scape-goat;* and most modern versions adopt the same or a similar rendering: Luther has 'the acquitted goat;' the Geneva Version of 1805, 'the goat destined to be thrown down the precipice:' Calvin and Diodati have *Azazel*, untranslated.] But this meaning is extremely difficult to be rendered probable. See *Gesenius's Hebr. Lex.*—Others take it for an Arabic broken plural, *nghrazazel, lonesomeness, solitude, desert*, אֶרֶץ גְזֵרָה. So *Bochart, Carpzov., Rosenmüller, jun.* in his Scholia, *Hackmann, Jahn, and Gesenius*, in his *Lehrgebaüde.* —Others have thought that by this name was understood a *wicked spirit*, to whom this *goat laden with sins* was to be devoted. So, following many of the rabbis, *Spencer, de Legib. Rit. Hebr.* and see *Ammon's Bible Theol. Rosenmüller's Ancient and Modern Oriental Illustr. Gesenius* in his Lexicon. The doctrine concerning demons, maintained by the later Jews and the Mahometans, actually applies this name [and others like it] to wicked spirits. But this might be a fiction of the later Judaism: at least, as we find no vestiges of a belief in wicked angels and demons before the time of the captivity,[1] we should hardly build the explanation of this subject upon such very insecure data. Comp. Lev. xvii. 7, and *Bochart* in his *Hierozoicon*, I. 745. —Finally, there are some who understand the word as compounded of עז and אֶזֶל, and signifying *the departing goat;* in which the only difficulty is that, in other places עֵז denotes a kid, not a goat. On this subject, see *Carpzov. Appar., Bochart, Marckii Sylloge*, p. 172. *Le Moyne Varia Sacra*, ii. 649. *Schröder, Frischmuth*, and *Schafshausen*, in their respective Dissertations on this subject; and other authors."

---

[1] "If even the high-priest himself should enter into it on more than this one day in the year, or more than a second time on that day, he would meet inevitable death." *Legatio ad Caium;* p. 1035.

(3.) On the SYMBOLICAL DESIGN of this observance, "It is not certain whether the goat which was driven into the wilderness, was considered merely as doing penance or making atonement for the sins of the nation, in their stead; or as carrying away with him the burden of sins, as it were from the presence of Jehovah. The latter idea appears the more probable, especially on account of the analogy with the offering of purification, mentioned in Lev. xiv. 4–7, in which the one bird's being allowed to go free could scarcely be for any other reason, than symbolically to take away with it the impurity of the leper. See *Witsius de Fœd.* 543. *Spencer*, 1051. *Bauer; Süskind;* and *De Wette.*

"(4.) No solemnity, similar to this day of atonement, is to be found in any nation of antiquity. The Mohammedan month of fasting, *Ramadan*, has some degree of resemblance to it; and still more the fast-day of the Hindoos, *Sandrajonon (Priestley's Compar. of the Instit. of Moses with those of the Hindoos, etc.).* The *Supplicationes* of the Romans, which were ordered upon any public calamity, were of a very different description. See *Livy*, iii. 7. xxiv. 10. xxvii. 37.—On the whole subject, see *Reland*, iv. 6. *Carpzov. App.* 433. *Leusdeni Philol. Hebr. Mixt.* 281. *Mœller de Rit. Festi Exp. Hochstetter de Festo Exp. Bauer. Jahn.*

---

[1] A position which we do not concede to Dr Winer.

"(ii.) The *lesser kind* of sin-offerings. These were brought in the following cases.

"1. When a magistrate committed an offence through error. The sacrifice was a kid, whose blood was partly smeared upon the altar, partly poured upon the ground; the fat pieces only came to the altar; the rest fell to the priest. Lev. iv. 22-26.

"2. When a private person sinned through ignorance. The sacrifice was a ewe or a female kid.

"3. When a woman was purified from a long-continued hæmorrhage; or, after child-birth, had reached the time of purification. Lev. xv. 25-30. xii. 6-8.

"4. Lev. xv. 2, 14, 15.

"5. When a Nazarite had touched a corpse, or the time of his vow was completed. Num. vi. 10-14.

"6. On the consecration of a priest or Levite. Lev. ix. 23. Num. viii. 8, 12.

"7. On the purification of a leper. Lev. xiv. 19-31.

"In the cases 3, 4, 5, and 7, the sacrifice was usually a sheep or a dove: but in the 6th, an ox or a goat. References as above, and Num. vii. Ezra vi. 17. viii. 35. Num. xix. But all the cases 3 to 7, are exempted from the general rule in Lev. iv. 2, 13. xxii. 27.

"From a comparison of the directions concerning trespass-offerings and sin-offerings, it follows:

"1. That in numerous cases, both the kinds of sacrifice were united.

"2. That in both, an acknowledgment of trespass or sin was required.

"3. That the chief difference between the ceremonies prescribed in each case consisted in the manner of sprinkling the blood. On the other hand, it is not clear what distinction the lawgiver made between אָשָׁם *trespass*, and חַטָּאת *sin:* since there does not appear any foundation for making an essential difference in the kind of the transgressions which were expiated by the one or the other kind of sacrifice. Hypotheses on this subject, widely different or directly contradictory to each other, have been maintained by the numerous writers on Hebrew Archæology; of which only the principal can be here stated, and a brief opinion offered upon them.—(See *J. C. Schubert de his Sacrif.*)

"(1.) Some have held the sin-offering to have been presented on occasion of the more heinous offences, and the trespass-offering for those of a less aggravated character (*Venema*, *Diss. Sacr.* 822, comp. *Maimonid. Mor. Nev.* iii. 46). Others invert this opinion (*Bonfrère on Lev.* iv.). The former sentiment has however more in its favour, though the distinction does not apply to every case of sin-offering; as, of the lesser kind, cases 3, 4, 5, and 7, and in no way is it made clear, *by what standard* the lawgiver estimated the comparative greatness or lightness of transgressions.

"(2.) Some refer the trespass-offerings to the violation of a covenant, or tacit contract, with the priests, the fellow-citizens, and the married men; and they suppose that the reason of the presentation lies in the accusing conscience of the offender (*Cremer. Antiq. Sacr. Pœc.* ii. 75); but this cannot be applied to the case of lepers; and, upon the whole, the idea of a covenant is too far-fetched. Also, it is not peculiarly nor merely the priest who sustained damage, by the alienation of anything that was consecrated to Jehovah: but we may, with equal propriety, apply the same term to the violation of a covenant between Jehovah and mankind; consequently the whole hypothesis is overthrown, for this idea of a covenant with Jehovah may be applied to all the kinds of sin-offering.

"(3.) Others suppose that the trespass-offerings were to be brought by those whose transgression was secret, or incapable of being proved by any human accuser; but the sin-offerings, by those whose crimes might be proved by witnesses. (*Relandi Antiq. Sacr.* iii. 4, 4. *Schulz Archæol.* 269. *Schwarz de Nexu Doctr. Lev. et Chr.* 20. *Bauer*, i. 148.) For the support of this opinion, stress is laid upon a passage in Josephus,[1] and another in Philo.[2] But De Wette justly remarks that this difference does not apply to all the cases that have been adduced (*e.g.* Num. vi. 12, 14. Lev. xiv. 12, 24. Lev. xv. 25–30), and he adds, 'It may be supposed that the true reason of a distinction, which had at first existed between those kinds of sacrifice, had, in process of time, gone into oblivion, and become neglected; while yet the distinction itself was, in an imperfect manner, kept up.'

---

[1] "He who from ignorance falls into this amenableness, offers a lamb and a female kid of the same age.—But he who commits the offence, being himself aware of it, though no other person could convict him, sacrifices a ram; for so the law ordains."—*Antiq. Jud.* III. ix. 3.

[2] "If any person tell a lie about a partnership, or a thing deposited with him, or a thing that has been stolen, or a thing found which another had lost, though he may have thought that he had escaped conviction from accusers, yet he becomes his own accuser, convicted inwardly by his own conscience, and he takes the blame to himself for his falsehood and perjury, confessing to the opposite party the injustice which he has done;—he must restore the property that had been alienated,—adding a fifth of the value;—the law commands him to bring a ram."—*De Victimis*, *Op.* p. 844.

"(4.) Others have regarded the trespass-offering as a sacrifice for a sin of *omission*, and the sin-offering for one of *commission.* So *Michaelis*, on Lev. v. 1–5. *Suppl. ad Lex.* 718. *Warnekros's Antiq.* 150, 153. *Babor's Antiq.* 436. *Simonis's Jewish Antiq.* iii. 3. *Jahn*, ii. 331. iii. 388; and, on the contrary side, *Bauer*, 148. *Gesenius's Lex.* אָשָׁם. An example of trespass-offerings for sins of active transgression occurs in Lev. v. 17–19. (Against the highly arbitrary conjecture of Michaelis, see *Vater on the Pentat.*) The passages, Num. vi. 11. Lev. xiv. 12, 24. Lev. xv. 25, etc. treat not in the least of sins of omission. Lev. v. 17–19, stands against Saubert's hypothesis, that by *transgressions* אָשָׁם intentional and deliberate crimes were intended, and by *sins* חַטָּאת the offences arising from ignorance or error, Lev. v. 6, opposes Rosenmüller, who maintains that male lambs were always used.

"As none of these attempts is satisfactory, and as, in the statements of the law itself, nothing is contained that can, in any measure, conduct us safely to a determination upon the distinction between the sin-offering and the trespass-offering, it seems best entirely to renounce making a distinction.

"It remains to be investigated, *what idea*, as to the DESIGN and END, was connected with the putting to death of the victim sacrificed in sin-offerings and trespass-offerings; that is, whether the sacrifice was regarded merely as a *present to the offended Deity:* or, as Michaelis supposed, a *civil penalty* (*Mosaic Law*, IV. 64); or as a *representative and substitute* of the person who offered it, thus acknowledging himself to be a sinner, and to be deserving of death (see the Rabbinical work *Reschith Chocma*, 3. *Grotius de Satisf.* cap. x. *Staüdlin* in the *Göttliche Bibliothek*, ii. 847. *Süskind* in *Flatt's Magaz.* iii. 196). The formula 'shall make an atonement for him,' etc. (Lev. v. 18. xiv. 19, and many other places), does not completely clear up the subject: and the laying on of the hand is not *decisive* in favour of the last idea, since that ceremony was used in other sacrifices. But the following reasons favour this idea of the death of the victim as a *substitute* for the offerer.

"1. As the sin-offerings were usually attended with blood, and as the Hebrews regarded the blood as the seat of life (Lev. xvii. 1), the shedding of the blood might be a very proper symbol of the out-streaming life: compare also Lev. vi. 19.

"2. Other sacrifices also were symbols of a substitutionary death: for example, the sacrifice for ratifying a covenant (Jer. xxxiv. 18–20); and the sin-offering on account of a murder perpetrated by some unknown person (Deut. xxi.). This idea stands also in evident connexion with the *Azazel*, or goat for a sin-offering, which, on the great day of atonement, was driven into the wilderness.

"3. חָטָא signifies *to bear the loss of anything*, or *to make good the damage sustained* (Gen. xxxi. 39); and this word is also used to denote an *expiation:* and so the noun כֹּפֶר (*kopher*) connected with the verb כִּפֵּר (*kipper*) denotes a *ransom-price.* [This noun and verb are those used in the description of the Levitical sacrifices.]

"4. The idea of an expiation by sacrificed victims was undeniably prevalent among other nations of antiquity. Of the Egyptians, Herodotus says, that having cut off the head of the sacrificed victim, 'they utter a long string of execrations upon it,—and they throw it into the river:—in uttering their execrations,—their design is that, if any evil be imminent over themselves, the sacrificers, or over their country, it may be turned upon this head. In this manner, with regard to the heads of sacrificed animals, and the libations of wine, all the Egyptians use the same rites in all their temples.' *Euterpe*, 39. And so Cæsar, concerning the Gauls; 'They are all extremely addicted to superstition: therefore it is their practice, when seized with alarming diseases, or going to battle, or exposed to other dangers, to vow that they will sacrifice human victims, or even themselves; in which sacrifices the Druids are the priests: for it is their opinion that the majesty of the immortal gods can be propitiated, only by giving the life of man for the life of man.' *B. G.* vi. 16."

iii. Of the kinds of sacrifice, the last to be enumerated is "the THANK-OFFERING (זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים, *εὐχαριστικὸν, χαριστήριον, εἰρηνικόν·*) consisting in the presentation of a bull, sheep, or goat, without blemish, and of either sex; which was brought by the offerer, with laying on of hands, to the altar, and was slain by him on the south side of it. The priest received the blood and sprinkled it round the altar. The pieces of fat only were burned. The breast and shoulder, the former of which the offerer was to *heave* and the latter to *wave*, belonged to the priest. The rest was applied to the use of a sacrificial feast: compare 1 Cor. x. 18.

"The thank-offerings were brought, sometimes on account of a particular blessing received from Jehovah, called therefore *a sacrifice of praise* (שֶׁלֶם תּוֹדָה, LXX. θυσία ὁμολογίας, αἰνέσεως); sometimes from the general feeling of pious inclination, a *free-will offering* (נְדָבָה); sometimes on the satisfaction of a vow (נֶדֶר), Num. vi. 14. The first were united with meat-offerings consisting of unleavened cakes, and a leavened loaf which went to the priest: the sacrificial feast was obliged to be held on the same day: Lev. vii. 15, 16; while, in the case of any other thank-offering, this feast might be put off to the second day (Lev. vii. 16. iii. 7, 11–36. Deut. xii. 12–18). *Carpzov.*, 706. *Bauer*, i. 119. *Jahn*, iii. 395.

"Among thank-offerings, in the most extensive sense, might be reckoned the presentation of the first-born and the first-fruits, the second tythe, and the Lamb of the passover."

On the respective articles which Dr Winer has thus elucidated, the reader may advantageously consult the recent English edition of *Calmet's Dictionary*, with the *additions* of the late *Mr Charles Taylor.*

NOTE. IX.—page 33.

THE CROWNED PRIEST AND KING.

Zech. vi. 13. To assure ourselves of correctly interpreting this verse, it is necessary to review the whole scene as represented in vision to the prophet; chap. vi. 9–15. The returned Jews were dejected by their difficulties, and had sunk into supineness and coldness. The prophet is directed to receive a contribution of silver and gold, which four principal persons, recently arrived from Babylon, had brought in aid of the restoration of the temple. The idea of a contribution or a consecrated gift is inferred from the connexion and circumstances, and from the exact rendering of the words, "Take from the captives [literally, *the captivity;* but the abstract noun is often put to denote the persons who had been dragged into captivity; as, for instance, Ezra vi. 19. Jer. xxviii. 4. xxix. 1, 4, 20, 31. Ezek. i. 1. iii. 11, 15. xi. 24, 25. Dan. vi. 14], from Heldai, from Tobijahu, and from Jedaiah:" something must be understood as governed by the verb, and this is supplied after the same verb in the next sentence, "Take silver and gold." With a portion of this silver and gold, he is instructed to make, or procure to be made "crowns:" how many, is not mentioned; but *two* is the most probable and generally supposed number, because, had more been signified, it is contrary to usage to omit the numeral; because one crown seems to be intended to be made of each of the two metals; and because the reference of this coronation is to the two offices of royalty and priesthood.[1] These crowns he is to place, with the solemnity of a prophetic act commanded by God, upon the head of Joshua; uttering a divine declaration. After this ceremony, he is directed to commit the crowns to the four persons, who had been witnesses of the act, that they might deposit them in the temple, to be a constant memorial of this significant and encouraging transaction. There is great difficulty in the interpretation of the last clause of v. 13, whether, by שְׁנֵיהֶם *the two* or *them both*, we are to understand Jehovah and the person predicted and named a branch, as is maintained by De Dieu and Vitringa; or Zerubbabel and Joshua; or the two offices of dignity represented by the two crowns, and as Michaelis thinks, by two thrones also; or the two great parties of Jews and Gentiles who, by the gospel of Christ, were to be brought into one united body. Each of these opinions has been maintained by persons of learning and judgment. The second seems unwarranted, because Zerubbabel has no share in this part of the prophecy. The third is adopted by the larger number of eminent critics, among whom we find Calvin, Drusius, Henry, Prebendary Lowth, Michaelis, Dathe, and the younger Rosenmüller; but I must confess that it appears to me somewhat forced, and that the supplying by inference an antecedent to the relative increases the difficulty. The fourth is the introduction of a new idea, expressed by a pronoun of reference, but which has not the antecedent assumed, nor any grounds for supplying it to the reader's mind. But I conceive that no solid objection lies against the first interpretation: the personal and masculine form readily attaches to the two persons mentioned immediately before, and which must be the principal objects in the mind of the reader, Jehovah, and the person whose name and actions the prophecy describes: and the connexion of sentiment is natural, plain, and of the highest importance, namely, that there is the most perfect union of the Lawgiver and the Saviour in the "counsel of peace," the plan of wisdom, rectitude, and love for conferring eternal blessings upon mankind. I have thought it right to state these reasons, in a great measure because I am led by them to differ in some points from a learned and valuable author, who has recently opened his great resources of biblical knowledge, in the illustration of the deeply interesting but difficult portion of prophecy comprised in the first six chapters of Zechariah. See *A Commentary on the Vision of Zechariah the Prophet: with a Corrected Translation and Critical Notes: by the Rev. John Stonard, D.D., Rector of Aldingham.* Upon these positions, I submit a translation of the whole passage.

---

[1] "The *crown* was a symbol of a person pre-eminently venerable and sacred: among the ancient Hebrews, it was worn not only by kings, but also by priests (Ex. xxviii. 36, 37. xxix. 6. 2 Sam. i. 10), the form of each being somewhat different. The double crown placed upon the head of a single person, Joshua, represented the twofold dignity, the royal and the priestly, to be united in some one person, that is the priesthood of the Messiah (whom Joshua here represented) according to the order of Melchizedec, by which the Messiah was to be both King and Priest of the Most High God.—Joshua, both in name and in the prophetic signification of his office, prefigured the Messiah."—*Rosenmüller, junior, in loc.*

"Further, a message of Jehovah was [given] to me, saying, Take from [the people of] the captivity, from Heldai, from Tobijahu, and from Jedaiah; and go thou this day; go to the house of Josiah the son of Zephaniah, who are come from Babylon; even take silver and gold, and make crowns, and put upon the head of Joshua the son of Josedek, the high-priest; and speak to him saying, Thus speaketh Jehovah [the God] of hosts, saying, Behold, a man: his name Zemach:[1] and from his ground shall he spring forth and build the temple of Jehovah. Even he himself shall build the temple of Jehovah: even he himself shall bear the honour. And he shall sit and rule upon his throne; even he shall be Priest upon his throne; and the peaceful determination shall be between these two. And the crowns shall be [committed] to Helem, and to Tobiah, and to Jedaiah, and to Hen[1] the son of Zephaniah, for a memorial in the temple of Jehovah. And men from afar shall come and build in the temple of Jehovah, and they shall know that Jehovah [the God] of hosts hath sent me unto you. This shall be, if ye diligently listen to the voice of Jehovah your God."

---

[1] I have thought it advisable to follow Luther, Le Cène, Michaelis, and Dathe, in not translating this word; partly because the naked term *sprout*, *bud*, or *branch*, gives an image which, though readily admitted in the oriental style, does not comport well with our mode of expression; and partly because I doubt whether the rendering of the Septuagint and the Vulgate does not better express the prophet's meaning, in which case we should use the term *rising-star*, *day-spring*, or some equivalent expression. The word Zemach denotes that which shoots forth and increases, and is applied both to the budding and growing of vegetation, and to the rising and shining of a heavenly body: see chap. iii. 8; Is. iv. 2; Jer. xxiii. 5, in which places the LXX. render it by ἀνατολὴ, and compare Luke i. 78. The Chaldee paraphrast gives the clause, "Behold the man, Messiah is his name;" and it is "justly so rendered," adds Rosenmüller, for we have seen in chap. iii. 8, that the Messiah is intended by the name Zemach "*the Branch.*"

Probably in allusion to the annual Levitical expiation, and therefore with an anticipative reference to the real and effectual sacrifice of Jesus, the words are added to the first mention of the Branch and the Stone of salvation (ch. iii. 9), "and I will take away the iniquity of that land in one day."

NOTE X.—page 36.

These instances are the following.

"That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, He hath taken our infirmities and carried our diseases." Matt. viii. 17.—"And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, He was numbered with transgressors." Mark xv. 28.—"I say unto you that still this which has been written must be fulfilled in me, and he was numbered with transgressors; for certainly the things [written] concerning me have accomplishment." Luke xxii. 37.—"That the word of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled, which he said, Lord, who hath believed our report, and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed?" John xii. 38.—"Philip heard him reading the prophet Esaias:—the portion of the scripture which he was reading was this: As a sheep he is led to the slaughter; and dumb, as a lamb before his shearer, so openeth he not his mouth. In his abasement the judgment [exercise of justice] was taken from him; but who shall narrate his generation? For his life is taken from the earth." Acts viii. 30–33.—"Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report?" Rom. x. 16.—"Who himself bore our sins in his own body upon the wood [of the cross]; in order that, renouncing our sins, we might live to righteousness; by whose stripes [μώλωψ, the singular, put to denote the whole class of suffering from cruel bruises] ye are healed: for ye were as sheep going astray." 1 Pet. ii. 24, 25.

---

[1] The difference of the names in the two recitals of them, has been accounted for in various ways. In ancient proper names, both sacred and profane, variations often occur, arising from causes which we can only conjecture.

In these, as in many other citations, we see that the apostles did not bind themselves to a servile literality; evidently regarding "the mind of Christ" as residing in the sentiment, which might be expressed in various forms of words. They are generally, but not entirely, taken from the LXX. The first passage deviates quite from the LXX. and is nearer to the Hebrew, as it differs only by the use of a synecdoche (not uncommon in any language) applying the general expression to a more restricted particularity. The compassion of the Lord Jesus for the pains and sorrows of men, his unceasing efforts under oppressive difficulties for their relief, the fact of all our physical sufferings being the effects of sin, and the great fact also that, by the reconciling propitiation which Christ has effected, the "sting of death" and of all earthly woes is drawn out, and they are converted into instruments of blessing, to the faithful;—are considerations which show the reasonableness and justness of the application.

The quotation in the Book of Acts is taken almost exactly from the LXX. which does not present a close conformity with what some call "the Hebrew verity:" but there is accordance in all that is essential, the fundamental sentiments are the same, that the sufferings and death of the Christ were endured, not as deserved by himself but in direct contrariety to his actual personal merits, and therefore inflicted upon him as a substitutional person, or, which is the same thing in other words, a sacrifice for the sin of man, in order that all who cordially concur in its design, may be delivered from all penal evil and raised to the enjoyment of the highest good.

That no citation or allusion to the passage, as a testimony to the doctrine of expiation, occurs in the Epistles of Paul, must be acknowledged to be remarkable. The adversaries of the application have hence drawn an argument against it. But their conclusion is evidently illogical. We have, indeed, as much of the apostolic writings preserved to us as is sufficient to convey a perfect knowledge of Christianity, yet it is not certain that we have all that any of the apostles ever committed to writing; and it is far more than probable that many of their expositions, modes of teaching, and arguments from the Old Testament, have not been so perpetuated. Though we may not be able to give the reason for this, except the general one of the apostle John (chap. xxi. 25), it is our duty to acquiesce in the fact as divinely wise and beneficent, while we cultivate gratitude for that sufficient measure of inspired writing with which we are favoured. Unless we made a far better improvement of what we possess, no reason can we have for complaining that more has not been granted to us.

When our Blessed Lord, in the commencement of his last sufferings, applied to his case a sentence of this prophecy, he added a general declaration which appears designed to embrace the remaining particulars of it. "I say unto you that this which is written must be accomplished in me, *and he was numbered with the transgressors:* for also the things [or sayings, τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ] concerning me have an accomplishment." Luke xxii. 37. That, under this latter clause, Jesus had reference to the other contents of the passage, is freely admitted by De Wette, late Theological Professor in the University of Berlin, and now at Basle; who was one of the most daring Antisupernaturalists, but is now (1828,—alas, in a few years more, the hope has expired!)—said to have avowed a salutary change of sentiment. Would to God that it may be so; and that he may prove the sincerity of his penitence and conversion by labouring to remedy the moral mischief which he has perpetrated! "Quæ in illo loco adduntur, καὶ τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει, docent respici ad *plura alia* de Jesu præsignificata, quæ *haud dubie in illo ipso oraculo* quærenda sunt." (*De Morte Expiatoriâ Jesu Christi;* p. 94. Berlin, 1813.) In this disquisition, he readily admits that Paul and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews held the doctrine of an expiatory sacrifice by the death of Christ; but he, without hesitation or any appearance of modest difficulty, imputes their doing so partly to prejudice and superstition, partly to the apostles in general having misunderstood their great Master, and partly to a wise and benevolent dexterity; for, says he, "this doctrine proved of the greatest benefit to the interests of Christianity, as it served successfully to attack and overthrow the Jewish superstition, to which many Christians still adhered, by showing that all other sacrifices were rendered useless, and abolished by the sole and supreme sacrifice of Christ." p. 103. He represents Jesus as the purest, wisest, and best of moral teachers; forming and altering his plan according to circumstances; occasionally mistaken and failing in his calculations; but, with wonderful sagacity and presence of mind, making even those cross accidents to turn to good, in some other way; and, when he perceived that, from the position in which he stood, having mortally provoked the Jewish hierarchy, his falling a sacrifice to their vengeance was inevitable, he, with admirable heroism, making a virtue of necessity, boldly predicted his own violent death, and impressed the minds of his disciples with such sentiments as would ultimately convert his very disaster into the advantage of his cause. With respect to the doctrine of the Atonement itself, the subject of his book, he says, "If we consider the influence which this doctrine has upon the human mind, it is, in the highest degree, injurious to religion, by producing that quiet to the soul, conscious of its sins, which it ought to seek (*suis propriis viribus*) only by its own powers Yet I would not be understood to say that the doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ cannot be combined with sincere religion: I only affirm that the opinion of his death being an expiation for sin, is favourable to the indolence of men. The divine excellency of the Christian religion is especially conspicuous in this, that it directs men to seek their salvation within their own breasts, without any foreign aid whatsoever." p. 102. This plain avowal is, indeed, nothing more than the old Pelagianism, and is the general doctrine of our modern Unitarians; but if this naked statement should lead any to institute a serious comparison of it with the Holy Scriptures, the result can hardly fail to be useful. Who does not perceive that, by this theory, *prayer for spiritual blessings*, with which the Scriptures abound, is rendered absurd and even impious? And are the public in Germany capable of believing such men as De Wette, who, with the history of their own immortal Luther and his constellation of attendant stars before their eyes, can say that the doctrines of redemption favour human indolence?

NOTE XI.—page 36.

ISAIAH LIII.

Few divines or critics bearing the name of Christian, have been hardy enough to deny the application of this most distinguished prophecy to the sufferings and death of Christ, till some recent German writers, of the class which has obtained the unmerited denomination of *Rationalists*, have shown that scarcely any impiety is too bold for their taste in speculation or their readiness in avowal. The denial of all real prophecy or any other kind of immediate revelation, and the assertion that Jesus and his apostles had no sound and just principles in the allegation and application of Old Testament passages, are parts of their system: the rest, therefore, can occasion no surprise. But such adversaries are not to be answered by silence; and contempt is no part of the Christian's armoury. Our duty is to hear them with patience and candour, and to answer them as truth shall require.

The celebrated Dr William Gesenius (Divinity Professor in the University of Halle, and whose reputation as the great Hebrew scholar of the age has eclipsed that of Eichhorn) has stated the arguments of the *Anti-Messianists;* and it may well be supposed that he has not failed to represent them in all the strength that they are capable of, as unhappily he is a partisan of their opinion. I shall copy them from his *Philologisch-Kritiker und Historischer Commentar über den Jesaia;* vol. iii. p. 162–164. Leipzig, 1821. He, with De Wette and others of their kind, maintains that the object of the pathetic passage before us is to depict, under the figure of an imaginary person, the neglect and ill-treatment which the faithful and patriotic prophets met with from their ungrateful countrymen.

" — As a prophecy of the sufferings, death, and exaltation of Christ, this passage cannot be admitted; for the following reasons.

Obj. "i. The application to the Messiah which the New Testament makes of the place, is no proof of this being its original historical sense; because the established principle of interpretation in the period of the New Testament, was to expound and apply the Old Testament in a prophetic sense, without the least regard to the proper and genuine meaning of a passage. Moreover, this passage is not made use of in application to the doctrine of an *expiatory death*, and Matt. viii. 17 is quite contrary to such an application."

Reply. 1. That accommodations of Old Testament sentences are, in the New Testament, occasionally made to occurrences and occasions, as they arose, and to which there had been no reference in the original passage, we readily admit. But this admission does not involve any denial or doubt of the solid grounds on which Jesus and his inspired followers *declared* passages of the Old Testament to have been *uttered by the Holy*

Spirit expressly with a reference to the subjects to which they are attached. It is as clear as the noon-day sun, that, if this be not admitted, the claims of our Lord and Saviour to be a messenger from God, or even to be an honest man, are exploded; and there is an end of Christianity as a divine institution. Truly, it is a very melancholy exhibition of moral character that, with this consequence fully before their eyes, men should be found who pertinaciously maintain the antecedent, and yet persist in *calling themselves* Christians, and usurping the offices of Clergymen and Theological Professors![1] The position itself we oppose in three ways.

(1.) By appealing to the great general evidence of the supernatural origin of Christianity, and the divine inspiration of the Apostles.

(2.) By a train of argument upon the nature and design of the dispensations of God under the Old Testament; tracing a unity of plan from the beginning; observing the progress of this plan of gracious restoration; marking the comprehensive and admirable system of preparative instructions, institutions, and events; and evincing that Christianity is no other than the completion of the whole, the accomplishment of that one and sole method of reconciling a lost world to God, which his infinite mercy had put into operation as soon as sin deformed and ruined our nature. An enlarged view of this grand plan of God, constantly illuminated by the increasing discoveries of revelation, discloses innumerable points of *reference* and *contact*, between the dispensation of the patriarchs and prophets, and that of the blessed Jesus; *to the effect* that the *closest connexion* is shown to subsist between the Hebrew Scriptures and the Christian; and those individual instances of correspondence, which a purblind, narrow-minded, self-inflated rationalist dares to call inconsistent with *hermeneutic* and *exegetical* rules, are evinced to stand upon the strongest ground of reason and evidence.

(3.) By a sincere examination of the single passages, in which the New Testament writers affirm a fulfilment of the Old Testament, with all the lights that we can obtain from philology and history, and "comparing spiritual things with spiritual." In this way, the result of each process of investigation, to a mind imbued with a true spirit of piety, will be found most satisfactory. Others, alas! whose proud hearts will not "receive the love of the truth that they may be saved," embrace "strong delusions," and believe their own falsehood. In them is verified the divine proverb, "A scorner seeketh wisdom, and findeth it not." Prov. xiv. 6. On which saying Michaelis remarks: "The scorner finds fault with everything which the ordinary and sound understanding of men esteems as wisdom. He seeks wisdom with Diogenes's dark lantern; he confuses everything, and fancies that he sees folly everywhere. He makes difficulties and objections in things which all men believe, especially where religion and morals are concerned. It is quite the reverse with the man of good understanding. Even the very doctrines in which the scorner finds so many difficulties, are to him easy and evident.—A striking observation, in relation to the difficulties which the scorner studies to collect against religion and morality." *Anmerkungen.*

---

[1] See an article in the *Eclectic Review*, for July, 1827, on "The Neologists of Germany;" and another in that for November, on "Dr Bretscheider's Vindication of the Modern Theology of Germany."

2. With respect to the instance so confidently alleged; if these interpreters had the comprehension of mind to which they make pretension, it might easily occur to them that the mercy of Christ in healing men's diseases was an *indication* and *promise* of his powerful grace in the removal of all moral disorders, in saving from the guilt and power of sin. If the objection had any weight, it would go to the length of proving that Jesus was only a country-physician in Judea, and not a Divine Saviour for all mankind. Even the Polish Socinian Wolzogenius has dispersed the difficulty, if there were any: "The prophet applied these words to the pains and infirmities which Christ had to feel and sustain, in his own body and soul, on our account. That Matthew applies them to the bodily diseases of the people, was because the maladies of the body are often a sign of those which are spiritual, that is, of sins. So that this passage of the prophet was twice fulfilled; once, when Christ delivered men from diseases, and that with extreme fatigue and distress on his own part, labouring from morning till evening in healing the sick; so that, in a sense, he took their sicknesses upon himself: again, when, by his sufferings and death, he took away our spiritual diseases, our sins, when 'he himself bore our sins, in his own body, upon the cross.' 1 Pet. ii. 24." Cited in *Witsii Meletemata Leidensia*, p. 403.

Obj. "ii. Great as is the resemblance between the pious sufferer in the prophet, and the circumstances of Christ, still there are several circumstances which do not apply to him. Kings were personally to honour him; lii. 15. comp. xlix. 7. —Verse 8. 'The stroke is upon him,' ought to be in the plural, *upon them*, for לָמוֹ is never singular.—He was to have 'his grave among the wicked,' v. 9, but Jesus had his from Joseph of Arimathæa.—He was to share the spoil with the mighty, v. 11, which belongs to *worldly* triumphs."

Reply. 1. Is there the shadow of a difficulty in understanding the reverence of kings and the sharing of the spoil, as a most easy and obvious metaphor, denoting the spread of the gospel, and the religious obedience paid to the Saviour and Lord of the world? Has not the imagery been abundantly and gloriously answered by facts? And is it not proceeding to greater triumphs still? The circumstance of his burial, so far from containing a difficulty, is an admirable coincidence of the prediction with the event: for, though "a grave had been assigned to him with the wicked," in the intention of his enemies, who undoubtedly would have buried his body ignominiously, as they did those of malefactors in general, yet the peculiar providence so ordered it that the rich man's honourable tomb received his body.

2. The pronoun in v. 8 is certainly a grammatical difficulty, if taken to refer to the chief person spoken of. But (not to rest upon the reading of the LXX. εἰς θάνατον, showing that they read למוֹת *to death;* and approved by Capell, Houbigant, Lowth, Kennicott, and Koppe) the sense yielded by the proper plural rendering is perfectly consistent with the connexion, the design, and the reference to the suffering Messiah. The reader may have observed it in the Discourse to which this Note is appended. It adds, indeed, one more circumstance of marked recognition to the evidences of that designed reference; and thus shows the passage to coincide with many other Old Testament predictions, in which the final stroke of divine judgment upon the Jewish nation for their rejection of Jesus, forms a distinguished feature.

Obj. "iii. It is perfectly clear that the 'servant of God' in this place is the same person that is the subject of discourse in the parallel passages, ch. xlii. 1–7. xlix. 1–9. l. 4–10. li. 1–3. All these passages are commonly thus understood. But in them there is much more matter still, which cannot be applied to Christ; for example, that he should proclaim the opening of the prison, and the return from the captivity (xlii. 7. xlix. 5, 9. lxi. 1–3),—that kings should personally honour him (xlix. 7),—also, in xlix. 1–5. l. 4–9. lxi. 1–3, he speaks in the *first* person."

Reply. Thus, then, Professor Gesenius takes advantage of his own and his party's perversions and misinterpretations of other parts of this sacred book, to fortify himself in the abuse of this! To answer him thoroughly would require an analysis and investigation of the last twenty-six chapters of the Book. But the serious and truly Christian reader, who is acquainted with Lowth and our best English Commentators on this Prophet, is abundantly competent to do this for himself. In particular, he will observe the system of transition and parallelism, by which the temporal mercy shown to the Jews in their return from the captivity, is made the vehicle of illustrating the infinite and eternal mercies of redemption and salvation to the world. Were a party to come into an English court of law, with pleadings like those of the Professor's, he would be driven out of court with ignominy, upon the honest principle, that "no man can take advantage of his own wrong."

Not unconnected with this, is the hypothesis, first advanced by Koppe, and generally maintained by the Neologists; that the whole latter part of this book, ch. xl.—lxvi. was written by some unknown Jewish poet, upon the conquests of Cyrus, and his liberating edict to the captive Jews; an hypothesis, all the parts of which may be fairly met singly, *if we hold to the great Christian principle of* REAL *prophecy;* but of which it may be sufficient now to say that it deliberately and coldly makes this unknown writer, in his most awful descriptions of the prescience and almighty majesty of Jehovah, to have been carrying on an imposture,—an imposture beyond description audacious! For it is the very spirit of those portions, that the events described were yet future and remote, that they were now foretold, and that the fact of their prediction was *the demonstration* of the sole Deity of Jehovah.

Obj. "iv. The expression, *Servant of God*, never occurs as a denomination of the Messiah: also the idea of a Suffering and Expiating Messiah is utterly unknown to the Old Testament, and is indeed in direct contradiction to its predominating representations; even admitting, what is very doubtful, that this idea was taken up by some about the time of Christ."

Reply. Both parts of this assertion are a taking for granted the point in debate; and the latter is a most daring contradiction to HIM who said, *in express reference* to the writings of Moses and the prophets, "Thus it is written, and thus it was necessary that the Christ should suffer. Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and enter into his glory?" "And, beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." The men who can so insult the Lord of all, have no difficulty in trampling upon the words of his apostle; "Saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come; that THE CHRIST SHOULD SUFFER." Acts xxvi. 23.

Obj. "v. The application to the Messiah makes the whole description to be future; but this the form of the discourse does not allow. The suffering, depression, and death of the 'servant of God' are here depicted throughout as being *past*, as in liii. 1–10 (compare also lii. 14), all proceeds in preterites: but the exaltation of the same person is displayed as *yet to come* (lii. 13, 15. liii. 11, 12), and is expressed in future tenses. Thus the author stands between the suffering and the exaltation, and proclaims that the person who *so far* had suffered, shall *now* be glorified. The latter state of things only is that which is described as approaching."

Reply. The prophetic spirit selected the point of time which the nature of the case demanded, as most suitable to the religious intention of the whole manifestation: and this point of time is the solemn and awful pause, THE CRISIS OF HEAVEN, EARTH, AND HELL, when Jesus was lying in the arms of death! Those must be as void of taste as of a Christian mind, who do not feel the exquisite propriety of the time as adapted to the scenery.

Obj. "vi. This interpretation detaches the portion from its necessary connexion with the whole book (chap. xl.—lxvi.), in which the subject of the discourse is the close-impending restoration of the Jewish state after its exile, and the joyful compensation for their sufferings, which Israel was yet to experience. To a contemporary reader of this oracle, it would have been absolutely impossible, in this connexion, to transport his thoughts to a Deliverer expected in a far-distant futurity: and little could it signify to him, in his then existing circumstances, to know what would happen five hundred years after."

Reply. Thus do these profane mockers "blaspheme the things which they refuse to know (ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσι βλασφημοῦντες), and speak great swelling words of vanity." 2 Pet. ii. 12, 18. To this objection the answer to the iii. is applicable; and I add that it was a necessary part of the scheme of scripture-prophecy that the contemporaries of the prophets, and even the prophets themselves, could but very imperfectly understand the meaning of their own predictions. "The Spirit of Christ which was in them, testified before of the SUFFERINGS of Christ, and the GLORIES which should follow; to whom it was revealed that, *not unto themselves, but unto us* they ministered those things." 1 Pet. i. 11. On this interesting subject, the inquiring Christian will receive much benefit from the perusal of *Bishop Horsley's Four Sermons* on 2 Pet. i. 20, 21.

Obj. "vii. To conceive of this passage as a *definitive prediction* of a distant occurrence is contrary to the analogy of all the Bible-prophecies, which relate only to a futurity lying close at hand, in the way of general anticipations. The Book of Daniel indeed makes an acknowledged exception, whose xith chapter gives, in the style of prediction, a very detailed history; but with regard also to that, it has been proved, beyond all contradiction, that the Book was published after the event; and the chief circumstance did really not coincide, namely, that the kingdom of God should be set up immediately after the Syrian persecutions."

Reply. Here again the enemy shows himself in his true colours, those of a real infidelity. All the prophecies in the Bible, according to the Neologists, were nothing more than the anticipations of immediately occurring events; that is, the lucky conjectures of poets, politicians, and sagacious men, who might often have the secret direction of the affairs which they pretended to predict. Gesenius might have spared himself the trouble of detailing his foregoing objections: the single stroke of denying all prophecy would have been surely sufficient.—The proper answer to the objection, I hardly need to say, must be derived from the general study of the Evidences of Revelation, and particularly the Argument from Prophecy. This author is not to be dealt with as a sincere, though erroneous, fellow-Christian; but as one who needs to have his whole mind and heart brought out of the darkness of infidel guilt, to the grace and truth which come only by JESUS CHRIST.

As a contrast to this repulsive exhibition of perverted talents and abused learning, I introduce with refreshing delight a few words from another German divine, one who, in his numerous writings (benevolently adapted to all classes, from children and youth to mature Christians in general, to students in the universities, to philosophers, and to scholars of the first order), has aimed at the diffusion of religious truth as the basis of all that is holy and excellent in life; Dr George Frederic Seiler, Professor of Divinity in the University of Erlangen, who died in 1807.

"On a just acquaintance with the Scripture *scheme of prophecy* depends the true interpretation of all those places of the Old Testament in which occur particular predictions from God. A scripture-critic who allows of no real prophecies as having been fulfilled in Christ, and as still being fulfilled in his kingdom, sees nothing in all the passages which describe futurity, but the earthly expectations of a people greedy after power and riches; he puts meanings upon the words of the prophets, with which they have not the smallest connexion; he has no perception of the true nature of that moral and political kingdom of God, which the Father hath committed to Christ, the invisible King and Ruler of mankind; he distinguishes not the *divine meaning* of the prophetic declarations from human notions of its subject; he applies to the text of the prophecies, subjects of which they do not treat, and thus he is led to the adoption of explications absolutely false. *What fabrications have not been resorted to, to misinterpret the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah?* How many falsehoods have been written, to make it appear that the Old Testament contains nothing about Jesus Christ?"—"To him who rejects the true doctrine concerning the prophecies and their fulfilment, everything seems askance and crooked when he casts his careless eye over the passages in the prophets which contain divine predictions; and he transforms the prophets themselves into visionaries." (*Die Weissagung und ihre Erfullung, u. s. w.* p. 366, 367. Erlangen, 1813.)

Dr Gesenius proceeds with the following paragraph, which I cite chiefly for the purpose of showing a specimen of the modes in which the men of his school seek to impose themselves upon the careless and superficial, as worthy to fill pulpits and University chairs, deceiving (it is deeply to be feared) their own souls, keeping the word of reverence for Christianity to the ear, and breaking it to the heart. It may serve also, as an unexceptionable document, to prove what the Neologists mean, when, for any purpose, they may talk plausibly about *Prophecies of the Messiah*;—hopes, expectations, wishes and conjectures; the noble aspirings of some great minds after a purer religion, a worship of the Supreme Being, without ceremonies, in spirit and in truth, and the extension of this religion among all nations. (*Gesenius*, *Einleitung*, s. 2.)

"Yet with all persons this passage may and ought to be denominated *a passage relating to the Messiah;* yet in a somewhat different sense from what is usually understood. It falls undoubtedly within the compass of *Expectations of a Messiah* [Messianischer Hoffnungen]; and it applies directly to the formation of their noblest part, that the religion of Jehovah, with his true worshippers, should at last enjoy a brilliant triumph over the heathen, that the knowledge of God should be spread among all nations by means of the Israelites and their divinely inspired seers, although nothing is said here concerning the person of the Messiah, as in many of the oracles concerning the golden age. This portion of the Expectations of a Messiah is also precisely that which has been brought into accomplishment by the Christian religion; and, in this respect, we make no hesitation to acknowledge that this passage contains a *fulfilled Prophecy of the Messiah*."

Upon this portion of Isaiah, and that before cited from Daniel, there are observations well meriting attention, in a volume, small, but valuable for its learning, judgment, and piety; *Lectures on Prophecy, by the Rev. Charles Nice Davies* (Lond. 1836), the Theological Tutor in the College at Brecon (pp. 116-126), whose lamented death took place in 1842.

NOTE XII.—page 38.

I have taken pains to render the translation adduced in the Discourse, as exact a picture as I am able to draw of the sacred original. But I assure my serious readers that, in all their scripture researches, they will obtain eminent elucidation and satisfaction, by the *comparison* of translations, whether the ancient versions, or those made at the period of the Reformation, or those which have been produced by the learning and piety of more recent biblical scholars. Even translations which may, as a whole, be inferior, will often exhibit instances of successful expression, in single words and clauses, most remarkably bringing out the beauty and genuine force of the original. Among the modern versions, I beg leave to point out the extraordinary excellence, chiefly in the New Testament, both as to fidelity of sentiment, and felicity of expression, which distinguishes the French translation of Isaac le Maistre de Sacy, one of the illustrious Society of Port Royal, and a noble sufferer for truth and conscience. He died in 1684. See a most accurate, instructive, and interesting memoir of him, by the Rev. S. C. Wilks, in the *Christian Observer*, June, 1846.

To assist in this useful work, I here place together a close representation of four versions which cannot be very generally accessible to English readers, at least till the importance of the German language shall be understood, and its study more generally cultivated among us. And though these are but translations of translations, yet the affinity of our own language affords great facilities for a literal version, and for rendering very perceptible the character of each. The first is by the distinguished scholar, to whom the preceding pages have shown that I am so much indebted, Sir John David Michaelis, the celebrated Professor at Göttingen, who died in 1791.[1] The second is by Dr Seiler, mentioned in the preceding note, concerning whose new translation of the Prophet Isaiah the younger Rosenmüller makes the following observation: "The eminent Dr Seiler, whose merits in sacred literature are of the highest order, composed this version of Isaiah for popular use; to which purpose it is admirably adapted. But, on account of the profound knowledge and experience of the author in scriptural interpretation, the learned also will find in this work many valuable elucidations, and such as no other interpreter has touched upon." *Scholia in Jes.* vol. i. præf. p. xxv. The third is by the consummate Hebraician, though deplorable Neologist, Professor Gesenius. The fourth is from Rosenmüller's Latin. With regard to the latter two, how should we lament the power of prejudice and unbelief, which can make those eminent men insensible to the holy beauty of this exquisite passage, and can prevent their beholding in it the grace and glory of our Divine Redeemer!

---

[1] It is not without reluctance that I expose to the English reader the strange translation which that great man adopted of the second clause in v. 10; but I cannot honestly suppress it. The difficulty of determining the person, and of course the nominative of תָּשִׂים seems to have betrayed him, in a fit of eccentricity, to substitute אֵם *a mother*, for אִם *if;* and his interpretation was, that the church and nation of the Jews, personified as is usual with the prophets in the character of a female, rejected Jesus, and with unnatural cruelty gave him up to death. But surely any one of the three constructions is far preferable; (1.) as the second person, "Thou, *i.e.* Jehovah (whose good pleasure was declared thus to smite him), wilt make his soul [life, or *blood*, as נֶפֶשׁ evidently signifies in Gen. ix. 5. Levit. xvii. 11; and which Michaelis judiciously applies to v. 12, in his *Suppl. ad Lex. Hebr.* No. 1622, § 13], a trespass-offering:" or (2.) making נַפְשׁוֹ the nominative, and understanding it again as the object of the verb, "He himself shall make his own self," etc. or (3.) taking the verb in the reflexive sense, "his soul shall yield itself;" which Gesenius prefers, and supports it by referring to 1 Sam. xv. 2. 1 Kings xx. 12. Ps. iii. 7

I earnestly request my reader to improve this comparative view, by placing by its side the correspondent portion in Dr Henderson's learned and judicious *Translation and Commentary on the Book of Isaiah;* 1840.

From the necessity of printing the four versions in such a manner that their parallelism may plainly appear, a blank space has been caused, which I have thought it advisable to occupy with a close rendering of the version by Dr Ferdinand Hitzig, Professor of Divinity in the University of Zurich, published at Heidelberg, in 1833; an able scholar, but deeply tinctured with the irreligious character on which we have had painfully to animadvert. The words in brackets are inserted to prevent the German expressions from being misunderstood.

Isaiah lii. 13, to liii. 12.

[13] See! well proceeds my servant, mounts on high, raises up himself, and is very greatly exalted. [14] As many were terrified before him,—so disfigured, not human, was his look, and his form not that of men's children,—[15] So will he make many nations to leap [for joy]; before him kings will close their mouth; for what had not been told them, they see, and what they had not heard, they descry.

[1] Who hath believed our announcement; and, the arm of Jehovah,—to whom is it manifested? [2] And he grew up as a sprig before him, as a shoot out of dry ground, not form hath he, nor beauty, that we should look at him [with admiration]; and no look [of attraction], that we should long for him. [3] Despised and abandoned by men, a man of sorrows, and well knowing disease, and as one before whom men covered their faces; despised, and we esteemed him not. [4] But our diseases

HITZIG.

—he bore them, and our sorrows he took upon himself; and we regarded him smitten, stricken by God and tortured. [5] And he was wounded on account of our sins, crushed on account of our transgressions; the punishment, which was our benefit, lay upon him; and through his stripe-wheals is healing brought to us. [6] We all as sheep were wandering, we took each to his own way; but Jehovah threw upon him the guilt of us all. [7] Cruelly treated was he; and though tortured yet he opened not his mouth: as a lamb which is led to the slaughter-bench, as a sheep before its shearers silent; and he opened not his mouth. [8] By oppression and judicial punishment he is snatched away; and his fate, who minds it? that he was torn out of the land of the living, [that] for the sin of my people a stroke hit

---

MICHAELIS.

[13] Behold my servant! splendid and full of glory, high and greatly exalted is he. [14] As many at his presence have turned back astounded, since his appearance is too mean for a man, and his look debased as of one of the common people; [15] so shall he be the delight of the numerous gentiles, and kings shall close their mouths before him: because those to whom nothing had been written, see, and they who had heard nothing mark and observe. [1] But who believes that which he heareth from us? and in whose eyes is the arm of Jehovah displayed?

[2] He groweth up before him as a tender shoot, as a root out of dry ground: he hath no fine per-

SEILER.

[13] Behold, my servant does all happily; he is high, venerable, and greatly exalted; [14] so that many shall gaze astonished at him. Though his appearance, compared with others, is very mean, and his figure inferior to that of other men; [15] yet he will atone for many nations. Kings before him shall lay their hands upon their mouths; for now they know what they before did not perceive, they understood what they had never before heard.

[1] But, who believeth our declarations? Who acknowledgeth the mighty arm of Jehovah, when it is revealed? [2] He shoots up among them as a little twig, as the sprout of a root in thirsty ground. Beautiful form and noble aspect he

HITZIG.

him? [9] And with wicked men his grave was made, and with the malefactor in his death; though he no wrong had done, and no fraud [was] in his mouth. [10] But it pleased Jehovah that the disease should crush him: when thou makest his life a sacrifice for guilt! He will see children, [he will] long live, and the charge of Jehovah will be successful in his hand! [11] Free from sufferings, his soul will be delighted with the sight: Through his discernment, my righteous servant will make many righteous; and their sins he will bear. [12] Therefore give I him a share among mighty ones, and with strong ones will he share booty; for this, that he poured out his life unto death, and was reckoned with sinners; while yet he bore the guilt of many, and became answerable for sinners.

GESENIUS.	ROSENMUELLER.
[13] Behold! my servant shall be prosperous; high and exalted and greatly honoured. [14] As now many are astonished before him (—so disfigured is his aspect before men, and his figure before the children of men,—) [15] so shall many nations exult in him; kings shall close their mouths before him: for what had not been related to them, shall they see; and understand what they had never heard.	[13] Behold! my servant shall act prosperously: he shall be illustrious and exalted and very high. [14] As many were astonished at thee (so deformed was his aspect more than that of any one, and his appearance more than that of any child of man), [15] so he shall rouse up many nations; before him kings shall shut their mouths: for things untold them they shall see, things unheard they shall understand.
[1] Who trusts our message? The arm of Jehovah, to whom is it made known?	[1] Who hath believed what we have understood by hearing? Who perceives what the arm of Jehovah is preparing?
[2] He grew up like a sprig before him; as a root-shoot out of dry land. Appearance he had none, nor beauty, that	[2] He hath grown up as a twig before him, as a shoot out of dry ground. He had no form nor beauty. We

MICHAELIS.	SEILER.
son, no majestic figure: and should we look upon him who hath so little appearance? and should we entertain delight in him?	hath not. We looked at him; but there was nothing in him that pleased us.
[3] Contemptible! the most feeble of men! full of sorrows, and recognised only by his wounds! one who hid his face from us, and altogether contemptible! therefore we have not esteemed him.	[3] Disdained is he, scorned among men, the man of sorrows, known by his sufferings, so that men hid their faces before him: he is disdained, and we reckoned him as nothing.
[4] Truly he bore our wounds, and took upon himself our sorrows. We regarded him as one marked out by the stroke of God, and thrown down: [5] but for our sins is he wounded, and broken for our iniquity; for our benefit the punishment rested upon him, and his bruises are our healing.	[4] Of a truth, he bore our disease and took on himself the burden of our sorrows. We thought that he was thus by God punished, smitten, and tormented. [5] But he is pierced through on account of our iniquities, he is smitten on account of our sins. He was punished, that we might be saved: he was wounded that we might be healed.
[6] We all went astray like sheep, each one his own way: but Jehovah caused the guilt of us all to fall upon him.	[6] We were all wandering like sheep, and each looked only at his own way: Jehovah laid all our guilt upon him.
[7] He came to it, he submitted to it; and he opened not his mouth: as a lamb to the slaughter-bench he is led, and as a sheep which is silent before her shearers. He opened not his mouth for anguish; and he patiently took the sentence of condemnation.	[7] Of him it was exacted: and, though he was thus afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth, like a sheep which is led to the slaughter-bench; like a lamb, which in the shearer's hand is dumb and openeth not his mouth.
[8] Where was a providence that cared for his life? For he was torn out of the land of the	[8] From anguish, from judgment, he is snatched away. Who can describe his length

GESENIUS.	ROSENMUELLER.
we should feel joy in him; no aspect, that we should have pleasure in him.	looked at him, but there was no fair appearance that we should be desirous of him.
[3] Disdained was he, and deserted by men; sorrow-laden and marked with disease: as one before whom men conceal their countenances, we disdained him and gave him no esteem.	[3] The most despised and rejected of men, he was; a man afflicted with sorrows, eminently marked with disease: as an object from which men turn away their faces, he was so despised that we regarded him as nothing.
[4] But he was bearing our disease; with our sorrows he charged himself: and we esteemed him punished by God, smitten and distressed by God.	[4] Truly, he hath borne our sicknesses and carried our sorrows: but we reckoned him to be ruin-stricken, smitten by God, and afflicted.
[5] He was wounded for our sins, smitten down for our transgressions; for our welfare the punishment fell upon him; by his wounds we are healed.	[5] But he was wounded for our crimes, bruised on account of our sins: the chastisement which causes our welfare was inflicted upon him, and by his wheals we have got healing.
[6] We all, like sheep, were wide-wandering; each went his own way: but Jehovah threw all our punishment on him.	[6] We all like sheep have wandered; each one has looked to his own way: but Jehovah commanded to fall on him alone, the punishment which we should all have endured.
[7] Ill-treated was he, the only distressed, yet he opened not his mouth; as a lamb which is led to the slaughter-bench, and as a sheep which is dumb before its shearers and openeth not its mouth.	[7] He was cruelly treated and afflicted; but he opened not his mouth, as a sheep which is led away to the slaughter; and as a lamb which is dumb before its shearers, he opened not his mouth.
[8] From the oppression and judicial sentence he was taken away: and who, of his con-	[8] He was snatched away from oppression and judicial punishment; but who was

MICHAELIS.	SEILER.
living, and for the sin of my people he went the way to death.	of life? Out of the land of the living he is torn away: on account of the sin of my people he is smitten.
[9] His grave was assigned to him with malefactors; but with a rich man he was received at the time of his death: because he had done no unrighteousness, and no deceit had been in his mouth. [10] God took pleasure therein, to smite and wound him; a mother will give up his life for a trespass-offering. He will see a seed and live long, and what Jehovah hath decreed shall by him be brought to effect.	[9] His grave was intended to have been among sinners, but he was laid in the tomb of the rich man; for he had committed no wrong, neither was any deceit found in his mouth. [10] Jehovah, in fulfilment of his own gracious counsel, caused him to be thus smitten down and to suffer. Since he hath given up himself to be a trespass-offering, he shall be gladdened with his posterity; long, long shall he live; the gracious counsel of Jehovah shall, through him, proceed prosperously.
[11] After his severe toil, he will again look up with joy, and be satisfied: and by his doctrine will he, my servant, the faithful one, lead many to truth, and he will bear their sins.	[11] After the labour which he has endured, he has enjoyment and satisfaction. Through his knowledge, my servant, the righteous one, maketh many righteous; for he bore their sin.
[12] Therefore will I give him a share of booty with the great ones, and he shall have the mighty ones for his spoil; since he hath poured out his life's blood unto death, and was reckoned among malefactors. But he bare the sins of many, and will pray for the transgressors.	[12] Therefore I assign to him many for his booty, and he himself shall as his booty distribute the mighty; because he poured out his life's blood unto death; because he was reckoned among the transgressors; because he hath borne the sins of many, and hath prayed for the transgressors.

GESENIUS.	ROSENMUELLER.
temporaries, reflected that he was taken away out of the land of the living; that for the sin of my people the punishment befel him?	there among the men of his age, that reflected that he was cut off out of the land of the living! [Who was there that would say within himself], for the crimes of my people this suffering has been inflicted upon him?
[9] His grave was assigned with the evil-doers, with the godless in his death; though he had done no injustice, and no deceit was in his mouth.	[9] When he died, he yielded himself up to the impious and haughty, to be buried; although he had done no violence, nor was deceit in his mouth.
[10] It pleased Jehovah deeply to wound him. But, because he hath given up himself to be a trespass-offering, he beholds his posterity, and lives yet long, and the work of Jehovah prospers by his hand.	[10] Yet it pleased Jehovah to smite him with a death-wound. But, since he hath interposed himself as an atoning sacrifice, he shall see his posterity, he shall prolong his life, and he shall successfully execute the mandates of Jehovah.
[11] His soul, free from sufferings, is satisfied with the prospect. By his wisdom my righteous servant leads many to righteousness, and he lightens the burden of their sins.	[11] After the sorrows which he hath endured, he shall obtain that which will satisfy him: by his knowledge shall my godly servant bring many to godliness, having made atonement for their crimes.
[12] Therefore I give him his lot among the mighty; with heroes he shall share the booty; because he gave up his life unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors; because he bare the guilt of many, and prayed for the criminals.	[12] Therefore I will distribute to him many [nations], and he shall obtain the mighty for his spoil; because he poured out his life unto death, and was numbered with the wicked, and bare the sins of many, and interceded for the guilty.

NOTE XIII.—page 44.

ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF CAUSATION.

Here I am of opinion, that we can levy a contribution to revelation and the doctrine of redemption, from the very heart of the enemies' country. Some Christian writers, and especially Dr Isaac Barrow, have long ago published their conviction, that of power and causality we are, and, in the present state, necessarily must be, completely ignorant: and that all our knowledge of what we call cause and effect is nothing more than the perception of a series of antecedents and consequents. Till of late, however, Hobbes and Hume were the authors who had placed this subject in the clearest light; the latter having probably borrowed from the former. "We have sought in vain," says Mr Hume, "for an idea of power or necessary connexion, in all the sources from which we could suppose it to be derived. It appears that, in single instances of the operation of bodies, we never can, by our utmost scrutiny, discover anything but one event following another, without being able to comprehend any force or power, by which the cause operates, or any connexion betwixt it and its supposed effect. The same difficulty occurs in contemplating the operations of mind on body; where we observe the motion of the latter to follow upon the volition of the former; but are not able to observe or conceive the tie which binds them together, or the energy by which the mind produces this effect. The authority of the will over our own faculties and ideas is not a whit more comprehensible: so that, upon the whole, there appears not, through all nature, any one instance of connexion, that is conceivable by us. All events seem entirely loose and separate. One event follows another; but we never can observe any tie betwixt them. They seem conjoined, but not connected."—"Even in the most familiar events, the energy of the cause is as unintelligible as in the most extraordinary and unusual, and we only learn by experience the frequent CONJUNCTION of objects, without being ever able to comprehend anything like CONNEXION betwixt them. Here then many philosophers think themselves obliged by reason to have recourse, on all occasions, to the same principle, which the vulgar never appeal to but in cases that appear miraculous and supernatural. They acknowledge mind and intelligence to be, not only the ultimate and original cause of all things, but the immediate and sole cause of every event that appears in nature. They pretend, that those objects which are commonly denominated *causes*, are in reality nothing but *occasions;* and that the true and direct principle of every effect is not any power or force in nature, but a volition of the Supreme Being." *Hume's Philos. Essays.* Ess. vii.

Upon this doctrine, a late eminent philosopher has observed: "Mr Hume had the merit of showing clearly to philosophers, that our common language, with respect to cause and effect, is merely analogical; and that if there be any links among physical events, they must for ever remain invisible to us. If this part of his system be admitted; and if, at the same time, we admit the authority of that principle of the mind, which leads us to refer every change to an efficient cause; Mr Hume's doctrine seems to be more favourable to theism, than even the common notions upon this subject: as it keeps the Deity always in view, not only as the first, but as the constantly operating efficient cause in nature, and as the great connecting principle among all the various phenomena which we observe. This, accordingly, was the conclusion which Malebranche deduced from premises very nearly the same with Mr Hume's." *Mr Dugald Stewart's Elements of the Philosophy of the Mind*, vol. i. p. 549. 8vo ed.

In truth, the evidence of this fact lies in every man's own consciousness. He has only to fix his reflection attentively upon it, to perceive that it is certain and unquestionable. But it is not implied, as perhaps Mr Hume would have been willing that his readers should infer, that events are fortuitous and insulated, that no connecting power exists, producing and maintaining a physical and a moral order. The proper inference is, that the phenomena of the universe are a collection of *constituted* series, the result of divine wisdom, the object of divine power, the production of HIM "who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will:" that the great moral constitutions of LEGISLATIVE RECTITUDE and REDEEMING MERCY, —are parts of the one, all-wise, harmonious, and perfect system of the universe; and that the union of all is the immediate effect of Jehovah's infinite power, acting from the highest reason, namely, holiness, conjoined with benevolence.

Note XIV.—page 45.

ON THE TERM, GUILT.

In the first edition this was expressed, "Jesus Christ voluntarily sustained the guilt and punishment of sin." As the term *guilt* is liable to misconstruction, I have declined retaining it; though it was used in a sense quite, I trust, unobjectionable. We commonly employ this term both in the sense of LEGAL ANSWERABLENESS (*reatus*), and of BLAMEWORTHINESS (*culpa*). It was only in the former sense, and by no means in the latter, that the word was here introduced. In divinity, as well as in other sciences, it is necessary to attach to some terms a technical definiteness of signification, much more restrained than the ordinary acceptation of the same words. It were to be wished that, in all such cases, we had words appropriated only to the particular objects: but the usage of language (quem penes arbitrium est, et jus, et norma loquendi) forbids such a wish. If scepticism, or rashness should raise a cavil, we can only reply, that the cavil is unreasonable. No man ridicules mathematical terms, because, in many instances, they are the words of common life, employed in a very restricted signification.

"In regard to the phrase *guilt of Adam's first sin* [in the Westminster Assembly's Catechism], it is well known that many great divines have considered GUILT as intending simply *exposure or liability to punishment;* and this, either for one's own sin or that of another." *Letters to Prof. Stuart, by Daniel Dana, D.D.* Boston, New Engl. 1839: p. 22.

NOTE XV.—page 48.

ON THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST FOR US.

It is a common method of eluding the force of these scriptural passages, to maintain their simple meaning to be that Christ gave himself, suffered, and died for us, that is, *for our benefit;* in other words, we derive from his death important advantages, such as evidence of his sincerity, confirmation of our faith in his mission, and a valuable example of suffering virtue. But, according to this reasoning, our benefit from the death of Christ is only one article of the general sum of blessing derived from him, and to which his exemplary life, his doctrine, his miracles, and above all, his resurrection, contributed as much, or more, than his death. We should, therefore, have expected to find the forgiveness of our sins, and deliverance from condemnation, ascribed equally to any or to all of these. But how different is the fact! Christ lived, and taught, and proved his divine commission, for us; and we have thus a most important benefit from him in those respects: but it is to his *sufferings* and *death alone* that the New Testament attributes the putting away of sin, remission, propitiation, reconciliation, redemption, and peace with God. This very marked difference deserves most serious consideration from those who deny, or doubt, the doctrine of the atonement. Another circumstance places this argument in a still stronger light. To the piety and constancy, the sufferings and martyrdom, of Christ's immediate disciples, we are immensely indebted; as in those facts, combined with their peculiar circumstances, we find the evidence of the divine origin of Christianity and the most edifying lessons of every virtue. Neither were they insensible to the benefit which would hence accrue to the cause of religion; and the contemplation of it was to their disinterested spirits a source of the purest delight. "Yea, if even I be poured out as the libation upon my sacrifice and ministerial service [for the establishment] of your faith, I myself rejoice, and I congratulate you all." Phil. ii. 17. "I now rejoice in my sufferings for you; and I go on to endure in my flesh what yet remain of these afflictions [for the cause] of Christ, for [the good of] his body, which is the church." Col. i. 24. Thus strongly does the apostle recognise the fact, of the great advantages to be derived from his own sufferings to his fellow-christians. But how does he shrink back from putting those advantages in *the same relation* to the salvation of mankind, which belonged to the sufferings of his Lord! "Was Paul crucified for you?" 1 Cor. i. 13.

Another objection is, that the obedience and devotions of Christians are called *sacrifices* (Rom. xii. 1. 1 Pet. ii. 5. Heb. xiii. 15), because they are acts of consecration and submission to God; and that, therefore, nothing higher may be intended in the language of the New Testament concerning the sufferings of Christ. To which we reply:

1. That the use of such terms with relation to Christ is not slight and incidental, but is amply illustrated by a copious variety of additional expressions, which place their sense out of all reasonable doubt.

2. That, in the secondary senses of words, the primary idea is often dropped, and only the accessory one remains. Obedience and prayer were the accessories of the primary notion of sacrifice: and agreeably to the usage of all language, the term itself would come to be applied, in a limited acceptation, to any act expressing devotedness to God.

3. That in the instances adverted to, there is an allusion to the kinds of sacrifice among the Hebrews called thank-offerings, peace-offerings, and free-will-offerings.

NOTE XVI.—page 53.

SATISFACTION.

This term has been too often misconceived, and upon such misconception gross prejudices are founded against our doctrine. I beg permission, therefore, to state the sense in which it is here used, following the authority of the most accurate divines, Stapfer, Stein, Wyttenbach, Canzius, etc. By *Satisfaction*, in a theological sense, we mean, *such act or acts as shall accomplish all the moral purposes which to the infinite wisdom of God appear fit and necessary under a system of rectoral holiness, and which must otherwise have been accomplished by the exercise of retributive justice upon transgressors in their own persons.*

Sin produces a disturbance in the moral order which supreme wisdom has constituted in the universe. Such disturbance is an endeavour to cast disapprobation and contempt upon that supreme wisdom, and upon all the moral and legislative attributes of the Deity; holiness, justice, veracity, authority, and power. Were the divine government to connive at such disturbance of moral order, it would acquiesce in its own dishonour. It cannot connive at such disturbance in *any* instance, or in *any* degree, however small in the partial estimation of mortals; for great and small are relative ideas, and of the whole sum of moral relations the Infinite Mind alone is competent to judge: and, were a single instance connived at, the *moral principle* would be violated, and the series of consequences would extend illimitably to the subversion of the whole system of moral order in the universe.—Such is the outline of an admirable train of reasoning, solely on the principles of natural ethics, by the acute and excellent Stapfer, in his *Inst. Theol.* vol. i. p. 249–258.

If, then, the work of Christ have that excellency and merit, which the unerring justice of heaven has seen to be an actual doing of that which was requisite to compensate for the injury perpetrated, and to restore the moral harmony which had been violated, it may, with the utmost propriety, be called a *Satisfaction.* The theological use of the word was probably introduced from the Roman law. Tertullian, who was well acquainted with that science, says, "Christus peccata hominum omni satisfactionis habitu expiavit:" which may be, I conceive, justly translated, "Christ atoned for the sins of men by a satisfaction perfect in every respect." He clearly shows his understanding of the term, when he says that our Lord, by healing the wound of Malchus, repaired the injury; "sanitatis restitutione ei, quem non ipse vexaverat, satisfecit." *De Patientiâ,* cap. iii.

I would not be rude, nor on a sacred subject jocular; but *sit mihi liberum sensus animi proferre.* As empirics in medicine, contented with a few facts imperfectly understood and ill-combined, deride the extensive search and the cautious inductions of the enlightened physician; and as the vulgar, looking only at appearances as they seem to them, reject and often hold in high contempt the demonstrated facts of natural philosophy; so those who disbelieve the atonement of Christ and its correlate doctrines, seem to me to form their sentiments from a very superficial consideration, hasty and incomplete views, and an unwarrantable confidence in first appearances; overlooking the great principles and general laws of a comprehensive moral system. Above all, I fear that they overlook the nature and obligations of obedience to the will of God, the rational grounds on which those obligations rest, and the true reasons of the demerit of sin. "Late philosophers," says President Edwards, "seem ready enough to own the great importance of God's maintaining steady and inviolable the laws of the natural world. It may be worthy to be considered, whether it is not of as great, or greater, importance, that the law of God, that great rule of righteousness between the supreme moral Governor and his subjects, should be maintained inviolate." *Works* vol. viii. p. 534.

NOTE XVII.—page 63.

CHRIST DENIED BY A UNITARIAN TO BE A SAVIOUR.

A monitory testimony to the tendency and the actual influence of the system which denies the doctrine of atonement, occurs in the *Monthly Repository* for March, 1813, p. 182. The passage is the more observable, as the correspondence in which it occurs was communicated to the Repository avowedly to demonstrate the practical utility of the Unitarian doctrine, in the promotion of pious affections, and as a case "in which the *experience* of the writer had very satisfactorily settled the matter."

"I agree with you in what you say on the doctrine of redemption: but why do we, Unitarians, not believing in the *common* notion concerning it, call Jesus Christ 'our Saviour?' Our *teacher*, divinely inspired, he certainly was: but does not *Saviour* imply something *more?* And is not our using the term as we do, implying an acquiescence in the abominable doctrine of a sacrifice for our sins?—a doctrine the source of so much impiety in the world."

This writer deigns not to give any qualification to the naked audacity of his language, though we must *suppose* that of the *terms* at least, which he vituperates, he knew the one to be the perpetual style of the N. T. and that the other is repeatedly employed. But let us, by a large extension of candour, supply an explanation. We will grant the writer to intend that his reflections should apply only to modern ideas under the terms *Saviour* and *sacrifice*, and that the N. T. uses the former word merely to designate Jesus as our Deliverer from vice and superstition by his salutary lessons of instruction, and the latter to express only an act of exemplary obedience. Having shown this courtesy, we affirm that the terms *Saviour*, and *sacrifice*, in the use and intention of the inspired scriptures, with regard to Christ, denoted those exalted ideas which we entertain. The truth of this position is the point at issue, between us and our theological antagonists. Our evidences are before the world; and it is our calm and conscientious belief, that the arguings on the other side have not weakened those evidences.

The reader will be gratified by a sentiment, original, though obvious, from an author who adorned his professional eminence with the riches of elegant and sacred learning. "It was the general opinion of the Jews, about the time of the appearance of our Lord on earth, that God was about to send into the world a Prophet,[1] or Elijah, who should not only reform them, but, as they flattered themselves, restore the nation to its former temporal[2] power and glory. A similar opinion in some measure prevailed about that time in the heathen world; and it is remarkable that the ideas of the Gentiles were more correct, and more consonant to what appeared to be the designation of Providence, than those of the Jews. The latter rested chiefly on the gratification of ambition and pride, and perhaps of revenge; the former expected an amendment of the moral character. The child predicted in the Pollio of Virgil, which it was believed was to appear about that time, was not supposed to commence his reign with conquest, victory, and triumph, but with diffusing peace over the world, and improving mankind by the purity of his precepts, and the excellence of his example; by releasing men from the bondage of sin, and the dominion of those evil passions that excited them to hate and oppress, not to love and protect one another." *Dr Falconer's Obs. on the Words of the Centurion;* Oxford, 1808, p. 16. Applying this remark to a well-known passage of Cicero, I would ask whether it is credible that the writers of the N. T. would constantly represent Jesus the crucified, by a term, which not only Jewish but Gentile usage considered as breathing the grandeur of divinity?—Verres, imitating the impious vanity of the Greek dynasties of Syria and Egypt, had caused himself to be inscribed ΣΩΤΗΡ, *Saviour.* "This epithet," exclaimed the indignant orator,—"how great! It is such that its full meaning cannot be expressed in any single word. He is a SAVIOUR, who gives salvation!" *Cicero in Verr.* II. ii. 63.

Another observation forces itself upon us in reading this correspondence, which, it should be kept in mind, is published *expressly as a pattern and display* of Unitarian piety and "experience." This is, that the basis of the whole is pure naturalism. There is no recognition of a single doctrine of revelation, except it may be reckoned such to admit that the Jews are kept a distinct people by a particular providence. Every other sentiment and expression is perfectly in the character of a Deist. Indeed, to my apprehension, the palm of *religious* superiority is due to the avowedly infidel meditations of the Lords Shaftsbury and Kaimes, in the *Rhapsody* of the former, and the *Essays* of the latter *on the principles of Morality and Natural Religion.*

---

[1] Matt. ix. 14; xvi. 14. Mark ix. 11, 12. Luke ix. 18. John i, 21; vi. 14.

[2] "When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Acts

NOTE XVIII.—page 65, and 122.

SOCINIAN NOTION OF CHRIST'S SACRIFICE.

Aided by the critical dexterity of the Polish Socinians, the author of the Notes upon the *Improved Version of the N. T.* has laboured to deduce from this verse (Heb. vii. 27.) an argument for the subversion of the whole doctrine of atonement. "*This he did*, *i. e.* offer up sacrifice, first, for his own sins. But Christ, in a moral sense, was sinless. See ver. 26, and ch. iv. 15. His sins therefore were merely ceremonial; that is, being a descendant of the house of Judah, ver. 14, he was, as to the priesthood, in an unconsecrated state. But in the same sense in which Christ offered up a sacrifice for his own sins, in that very sense did he offer himself a sacrifice for the sins of the people." *I. V.* p. 514. A similar gloss is given on ch. v. 3.

This great misinterpretation is anticipated and refuted by Dr Owen, in his Exposition on this Epistle. To his observations I beg permission to add a few remarks, as the question is of the first importance, and as the objectionable comment is now modelled in a new form.

I. It is assumed that the *sins* mentioned by the sacred writer are, not moral offences, sins properly so called, but only ceremonial disqualifications. Such assumption, without any attempt at proof, especially in a case of so much importance, deserves to be severely reprehended. It is one of the worst artifices of argumentative injustice; and I am concerned to say that it is often employed in the Notes on the I. V. That the assumption is untenable appears to me from the following considerations:—

1. As in settling the import of a term, the first attention should be paid to instances in the book itself under consideration, I must profess my conviction that of the twenty-five in-

stances in which *ἁμαρτία* occurs in the Ep. to the Hebrews, not one is determined to this construction; not one could bear it without a large indulgence to hypothesis; in one example (ix. 28.) it *may* denote a sacrifice for sin; in all the others it most suitably and plainly bears its usual sense of moral crime; in those which have an affinity to the instance in question, the reference to the evil and heinousness of offence against God, is manifest and emphatic: e. g. iii. 17; iv. 15; x. 17, 18, 26.

2. Of the numerous instances of its occurrence in the N. T. not one exists in which the term can be shown to bear this novel sense, or rather in which the contrary is not manifest. In two or three passages, it *may* signify a sacrifice for sin, according to a well-known Hebrew metonymy: but in all the rest, it most clearly expresses moral pravity. Dr Priestley, indeed (on Matt. ix. 2, 6), says: "It appears that, by the phrase, *Thy sins be forgiven thee*, Jesus at first only means, *May thy disorder be removed:* sin being considered as the cause of evil in general." *Notes on the SS.* vol. iii. p. 149. This is easily said, and it helps a weak hypothesis; but the necessary article, PROOF, is absent. The memory of Dr Priestley, on many accounts, I highly honour; but in questions of criticism and theology, his *αὐτὸς ἔφα* commands not my submission.

3. In the Septuagint and Apocrypha, and in the Hebrew O. T. I can discover no example of *ἁμαρτία* or חַטָּאת being used in the acceptation assumed. It appears always to signify *moral evil*, in the abstract, the act, the actor, the penal consequence, or the expiation. Grotius, on this text (referred to in I. V.), following Socinus and Crellius, proposes our Lord's *sufferings* as the object meant by *αἱ ἴδιαι ἁμαρτίαι*, and he refers for authority to Lev. xii. 8; xiv. 13; xv. 30. Let the reader judge whether these refuges do not totally fail the learned and valuable, though partial, annotator. "That this interpretation is absurd, and alien from the New Testament style, every unprejudiced person must perceive."—*Kuinöl.* And, on his own principles, what admirable sense does this gloss effect! *Christ endured sufferings for his own sufferings, and for the sufferings of others!* The good sense of Grotius seems to have recoiled at this consequence of his interpretation: and to help its weakness, he intimates that the passage relates to our Lord's escaping from his sufferings by accelerating his death. But, by what ingenuity this new idea can be adapted to the design of the text, the sagacious critic leaves his readers to discover. So

entangled often is the finest understanding, when it labours to make the worse appear the better reason:

> Delphinum silvis adpingit, fluctibus aprum.

II. This comment (both on ch. vii. 27, and v. 3) takes for granted that the imperfection of the former priesthood must find its *resemblance* in the great High-Priest of Christianity; whereas it is evident that, in this circumstance, a *contrast* is intended. The apostle shows that Christ possessed all the requisites to constitute him a real and effective High-Priest; many of which were of course possessed, though in an inferior degree, by the Levitical priests: so far he continues the parallel. But when he adverts to the imperfections of the legal priests, he strenuously insists on the contrast. The circumstances parallel are,—human nature; sympathy; divine constitution; man the *terminus à quo* of the function; God, the *terminus ad quem;* the presentation of thanksgivings and expiations and intercessory prayers, for the persons on whose behalf the priest officiates with regard to God. The contrasted circumstances are, the Divine Nature; the constitution by oath; real efficiency; the glorious excellency of the blessings bestowed; continuance to immortality; and the PERFECTION OF MORAL PURITY. Ch. i. ii. iii. 1–6; iv. 14; v. 10; vii. viii. ix. x. On the last particular, it is observable that, where the moral imperfection of the Jewish priests is introduced, particular care is taken to mark the absolute holiness of the Redeemer, by some strong declaration preceding or following. Ch. v. 3. comp. iv. 15. vii. 27. comp. 26.

III. Therefore the reason of the case, and ample proof from the connexion and the whole epistle, determine the relation of the phrase "*this* he did," to the single idea (ἀναφέρειν) of offering a sacrifice. A similar construction is in ch. xiii. 17; where "*this* [would be] unprofitable (i. e. by the frequent classical figure, meiosis, very distressful) to you," refers exclusively to the last preceding word. Rosenmüller, sen. a writer not thoroughly friendly to the sentiments maintained in this discourse, clearly acknowledges the justness of our construction. After copying (without acknowledgment, as his manner is) the unobjectionable part of Grotius's note, and citing an appropriate passage from Philo, he goes on: "It contributes to our happiness, that our High-Priest had not to offer sacrifice for himself; for we learn from it, that he acted and suffered altogether on our account and for our benefit." *Scholia in N. T.* Vol. v. p. 230. I cite Mr Peirce's Note at length, as the work, his *Paraphrase and Notes*, is now become scarce.

"It is a strange interpretation which some very learned commentators here give, as though Christ, in analogy to the Aaronical High-Priests, offered sacrifice for *his own* sins as well as the people's; since it is certain, from all the accounts given of him by our author and all the other penmen of the N. T., that our Saviour was always perfectly free from sin: and to make ἁμαρτιῶν signify *sinless infirmities* is very unreasonable: the word being never, that I can find, used in that sense. And indeed if it were, what occasion could there be to offer sacrifice for sinless infirmities? This interpretation appears to be inconsistent, not only with the current doctrine of the N. T., but with the scope of this place and the argument here used. To set this in a full light, let us consider .

"1. Upon what occasion this is brought in: and that seems to be upon the mention he had made of Christ's being 'harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners.' These qualifications are a good evidence that he needed not, as the high-priests under the law, to offer sacrifices for his own sins: but it will not, to say the least, sound well, that he should speak of Him as 'harmless and undefiled,' and immediately subjoin that he offered sacrifice for his own sins.

"2. Let us consider how his argument stands in this and the following verse. Two things he here asserts that Christ had no need to do, which were done by those high-priests; (1.) To offer sacrifice, from time to time, for his own sins; and (2.) To offer sacrifice, from time to time, for the sins of the people. The reason and evidence of the former he declares in the next verse; 'For the law maketh men high-priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath which was since the law, maketh the Son high-priest who is perfected for evermore.' The 'for' [γὰρ] here must connect this with somewhat that went before, which cannot be the last clause of verse 27, 'This he did once, when he offered up himself.' It must therefore, as indeed the nature of the argument shows, relate to his not needing to offer sacrifice for his own sins; for it is an assertion that he had none. 'The law made those high-priests which have [sinful] infirmity [and consequently had need to offer sacrifice for it], but the word of the oath (Ps. cx. 4.), which was [in David's time, and so] since the [giving of] the law, maketh the Son who is perfected for evermore;' and consequently needs not to offer sacrifice for himself. This connexion seems very clear. But then the question will be, what are we to make of that clause, 'For this he did once, when he offered up himself?' I answer, that our author, designing to treat again of his [Christ's] offering for the sins of the people (ch. ix. 12; x. 10–14), he here passes it over more slightly: and when he says, 'This he did once,' the pronoun *this* refers entirely to the *nearest* antecedent, the offering for the sins of the people, and the clause should be read in a parenthesis; and then the 28th verse will well connect with the remoter antecedent, and show he had no need to offer for his own sins. Or else, the sense of the 28th verse must be elliptical, and be thus supplied: 'And as to the other thing mentioned, his offering for his own sins, he had no need, as those high-priests, to do that; because the law maketh men high-priests which have infirmity [and so stand in need of an offering to be made for themselves]; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son a high-priest, who is perfected for evermore [and therefore needs no such offering upon his own account']. And, as the word τετελειωμένον stands opposed to ἔχοντας ἀσθένειαν, *having infirmity*, that is, sinful infirmity, for which there was need to offer sacrifice, I think it is better rendered *perfected*, as in the margin, than *consecrated*, as in our common text."

NOTE XIX.—page 66.

ON THE TERM SPIRIT, AS EXPRESSING THE DIVINE NATURE OF THE MESSIAH.

That the expression ETERNAL SPIRIT, and the correspondent ones "Spirit" (in 1 Tim. iii. 16, and 1 Pet. iii. 19), and "Spirit of holiness" (in Rom. i. 4), are intended to denote the DIVINE NATURE of the Messiah, is the sentiment of several good critics. Their principal argument is, that the object signified by these terms is something belonging to Christ, not extrinsically added, but essential to his person, and contradistinguished from that which, in the passages referred to, is called "the blood" and "the flesh," known Hebraisms to express human nature. The late excellent Dr Erskine has touched on this interpretation, in passing, but with his characteristic ability, in his Sermons, vol. i. p. 373. But the reader will find the criticism examined with much sagacity, learning, and candour, in the Annotations of *Cameron* and *James Capellus; Schoetgenii Horæ Hebr.* vol. ii. in locos; *Vitringæ* (filii) *Opuscula*, Leov. 1735.

NOTE XX.—page 67.

ON THE READING OF 1 TIM. III. 16.

Receiving ὅς as the genuine reading in this text, for which there is sufficient reason (see Wetstein and Griesbach); three constructions have been proposed.

1. That ὅς is put, by ellipsis, for αὐτὸς or ἐκεῖνος ὅς. But I am apprehensive that this construction would be foreign to the Greek idiom, both the classical and the scriptural, which would have required ὁ φανερωθεὶς ἐν σαρκὶ κ.τ.λ. Such ellipsis, though frequent in the oblique cases, is very rare *in the nominative;* and, in the few instances which, with some pains, I have been able to discover, it is used, not in the sense of *He who*, but of *whosoever*, and commonly with a generalizing particle; or else it is put partitively with μὲν and δέ. The only resemblance of exception that I can find is Rom. iii. 32. But even there, the enclitic proves that it must be taken generally; though we are apt to overlook this, from the apostle's passing so rapidly into the particular case, which was natural to his full and ardent mind, and is one of the peculiarities of his style. Thus ὅσγε *implies* a tacit reference to a general maxim, that *whoever* confers an immense benefit, may be presumed to be willing to do those smaller acts which are necessary to the completion of his kind intention.

If, however, this construction were grammatically unobjectionable, the very expression "He who was MANIFESTED IN THE FLESH," would ill comport with the denial of pre-existence in any other state or nature, to the being so manifested.

2. That μυστήριον is the antecedent to ὅς, as in Gal. iii. 16, and Eph. i. 13, 14. The objection to this is, that it would seem harsh and unusual to apply the word *Mystery* to Christ: but

such an objection is, evidently, not of much weight. The interpretation yields a good and important sense: and we are to receive, not dictate, the phraseology of Scripture.

3. That the ὃς is to be understood as the relative of Θεὸς ζῶν, and that the intermediate words are to be read in a parenthesis. This method was proposed in a letter to the late Dr Woide, by Vice-chancellor Cramer of Kiel. It is plain and natural as to both sense and grammatical construction, and it accords with the parenthetic style of the Apostle Paul. For these reasons, I conceive that it is entitled to be received as most probably the genuine construction. According to it, the passage runs thus:—"which is the church of the living God (the pillar and ground of the truth, and confessedly great, is the mystery of godliness!), who was manifested in the flesh," etc.

January, 1842. The investigation which it has been my duty to carry on since writing the preceding note, almost thirty years ago, has not led to a conviction that the opinion here expressed ought to be abandoned. I may be allowed to request attention to my *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, vol. ii. p. 384–390, and 406–412, especially p. 410; 5th ed.

NOTE XXI.—page 69.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE DEITY OF CHRIST.

The connexion between the subject of the present publication and the general faith of Christians concerning the person of their Saviour, is obvious; but to introduce the most abridged view of our arguments for the latter doctrine was impossible in the Discourse, and would be immensely disproportioned to the form and object of these cursive notes. Yet, as any man is at liberty to give a general opinion on an extensive question, when a detail of reasons would be unseasonable, it may be permitted me to express mine, without offence or seeming dictation. Having spent a considerable portion of my time in reading, not inattentively, nor, I presume to say, with a bigoted mind, works written against this doctrine, the conviction of my mind is that their combined efforts have not disproved the body of evidence adduced in its favour by many writers since the Socinian controversy arose, two centuries ago.[1] Some arguments have been proved inconclusive, some alleged texts irrelevant, and some defenders of the doctrine incompetent: but the citadel is the stronger for the destruction of cumbrous outworks, wood, hay, and stubble, which never properly belonged to it.

---

[1] Owen, Hoornbeck, Turrettin, Venema, Stapfer, Bull, Waterland, Calamy, etc. The Essay *on the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ*, by Dr Van Wynpersse,

While the conscientious believers in the Deity of Christ are becoming more careful and exact in their statements and arguments, it is to be wished that its adversaries would, on their part also, exercise more candour and justice. I cannot but think that there are good grounds for this wish, when I find some of our theological opponents representing it as a fact unquestionable, that we hold the Divine Being to have changed himself into a babe, to have bled and died, and laid in a tomb; that our sentiment is opposed to the style of the N. T. in its usual *distinct* mention of God and the Mediator; that we deny the Unity of God; that we believe in three Supreme Beings; and that we attribute to one of them the exercise of capricious rule, malignant passions, and blind rage, and to another a character of superior mildness and benevolence. Undoubtedly, they have a fair right to say that these, or any other conclusions, *appear to them* deducible from our doctrines; but they ought not to forget our denial of such inferences, and our solemn protest against them.

NOTE XXII.—page 74.

ON THE EXTENT OF THE ATONEMENT.

Many years have flowed away since these sentiments were preached and published, but I must confess that I have found

---

translated from the Dutch by the late Rev. John Hall, of Rotterdam (1796), is peculiarly judicious and impressive. An excellent work, which discovers the amiable probity and fairness, no less than the learning and indefatigable research, of its lamented author, is *A Plea for the Deity of Jesus Christ, and the Doctrine of the Trinity; by the late Rev. David Simpson, M.A.* An improved edition has been published by the late Rev. Edward Parsons. In a few instances, exploded readings are retained; among the many solid arguments some dubious ones occur; and sometimes other writers are quoted without due correction of their improper expressions.

Since the first publication of this treatise, the author has attempted an investigation of the subject here adverted to, upon the principle of a cautious induction, tracing the doctrine of a Messiah from its first revelation to the final descriptions of the New Testament; *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah.* On this and the other important subjects connected with it, he would earnestly recommend Dr Wardlaw's *Discourses on the Socinian Controversy.*

no reason to depart from them. The question has not indeed been given to quiescence; but the agitation of it, by holy and wise men, exercising towards each other the spirit of Christian friendliness, has done (I trust) no harm, and has even contributed to show that each party might engraft upon its own view that of the other, without any unfaithful compromise. A most able defender of the doctrine of "Definite Atonement" has the following passages, with which I feel it a happiness to adorn my pages. After disposing of a slender objection, he continues:—

"The objection proceeds on the mistaken supposition, that the Atonement of Christ is an exact equivalent for the sins of men; and that, had the number to be saved been either more or less than they are, or had their sins been of greater or less amount, the sufferings of the Redeemer must have varied in proportion. Now, to this view of the subject there are insuperable objections. It is at variance with what we have before established, namely, the *infinite intrinsic value* of Christ's Atonement. It overlooks the grand design of the atonement, which was, not simply to secure a mere *commutative* satisfaction to the Justice of God, but to glorify all the divine perfections, and to make an illustrious manifestation of the principles of his government before the whole universe of moral creatures. It leaves no room for such an unlimited offer of Christ in the gospel, as to render those who reject him without excuse: for, if the atonement of Christ bore an exact proportion, in point of worth, to the sins of those who are actually saved by it, then the salvation of any others was a *natural impossibility*, and no blame could attach to such for neglecting to embrace the proffered boon. Indeed, there would be no ground on which such an offer could be made.

"We hold by the view,—that the sufferings of Christ are to be regarded in the light of a *moral* satisfaction to the law and justice of God; which would have been requisite had there been but one sinner to be saved, and had that sinner had but one sin; and which would have been adequate, had the number to be saved been, to any conceivable extent, greater than it is.

"—The atonement of Christ being sufficient for all, possessing a *glorious, infinite, All-sufficiency*, it is with propriety made known and offered to the acceptance of all. There is, in this case, no natural impossibility in the salvation of any man. The secret design of God, by which the application is restricted, has no causal influence in producing unbelief. The obstacles to salvation are all moral; that is to say, are such only as arise from the native rebellion and hardness of man's own heart.—

"—The saving virtue of the Redeemer's blood,—in intrinsic worth, we regard as infinite." From an extensive and able treatise "On the Atonement and Intercession of Jesus Christ;" by the Rev. William Symington, D.D. Edinb. 1834; pp. 268, 269, 274, 302.

For those who intelligently believe in the infinite perfections of God, it is impossible to suppose that there can be anything vague, obscure, or vacillating in his purposes; or in his foreordained plans for the execution of those purposes. As little can we doubt that the intention of the Redeemer and the end contemplated by him as the accomplishment of that intention, are and ever have been in perfect accordance with the designs of the Almighty Father. The *intention* and the *effect*, in the operations of infinite wisdom and power, must be in perfect accordance, the one with the other. If all men are not saved, it could not be the intention of God to save all men. To escape from this conclusion, some appear to satisfy themselves with the idea of a general and indefinite design; which is in fact but attributing to the Divine Mind the formation of a sketch or mere outline, and that he is actually unacquainted with the minute filling up till the event declares it. It is in another and a prior branch of theological science, that the futility of such reasoning as this is demonstrated. That, therefore, in the work of expiation by the Lord Jesus Christ, the most important and glorious of all the divine works, there was the absolute and determinate purpose, that the work should avail to the salvation of a certain number of mankind,—is a conclusion evidently unavoidable. Equally also must it be admitted that the personal mind and intention of the Redeemer coincided perfectly with the absolute will of Deity. There could not be discrepance. Most plainly does our Lord, in alternating sentences, affirm both the fixed purpose and the boundless comprehension: "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me, and him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out; for I have come down from heaven, not to do mine own will but the will of him that sent me; and this is the will of him that sent me, that, of all that he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise them up again at the last day; for this is the will of him that sent me, that every one who seeth [ὁ θεωρῶν, contemplateth, exerciseth mental vision] the Son, and believeth on him, shall have eternal life, and I will raise him up again at the last day." John vi. 37–40. Thus delightfully and wonderfully do the declarations of the Lord Messiah correspond with those of the prophetic picture; "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all." Is. liii. 6.

But this view of the case does not exclude another. The work of Christ for the good of men is to be considered as one great whole. It may have, and probably it has, aspects and influences to an extent of which we have no conception in this our state of feeble and ignorant mortality. We know not what wonders are comprehended under "the good pleasure which he purposed in himself, to gather together as under one head [ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι] all things in Christ; both the things in the heavens and those on the earth." Eph. i. 10. It is therefore in harmony with the grandeur of the divine plan that the Saviour should be a centre of good to the whole rational universe, and especially the race of man; and in particular that his work should possess that excellency, merit, or value, which warrants the largest assurances of blessing to all and any who are honestly willing to receive it.

To me it appears that the positions just cited from Dr Symington are quite reconcilable with those of my venerated tutor, the late Dr Edward Williams. "In order that there might be a suitable, reasonable, and consistent ground of believing in Christ for salvation, we must infer that those parts of holy writ which represent Christ as 'the Saviour of the world,' which affirm that 'he died for all,' that he is a 'propitiation for the sins of the whole world,' and that 'he gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time,' ought not to be interpreted as denoting only the elect who are eventually saved from sin and misery. What possible good end can be answered by restricting such expressions? The restricted interpretation is doubtless intended for the avoidance of some injurious consequence; such as that Christ would die in vain for some, or that all must be saved, etc. But these consequences do not follow, except on an assumed and false notion of the *price* of redemption and *redemption* itself denoting the same thing.

These two ideas are essentially different, as related to different objects. For what is Redemption, in accurate thought, but the *actual* Deliverance of the subject from some personal evil; and in the present case, from condemnation, sin, and misery? But *is any person* thus delivered, before he is born? And what is the price of redemption, but a sacrifice of infinite worth, presented to the Holy and Just Moral Governor, to answer certain important ends? *One* of these ends is the actual redemption or deliverance of God's chosen; by the communication of the Holy Spirit, union to Christ, justification, sanctification, and persevering grace to be crowned with glory. *Another* end is, to afford an adequate basis for the rectoral design of God, in proposing Christ and his benefits to sinners in general, when addressed by the gospel-call. When we assent therefore that the *rectoral design*, founded on the *price* of Redemption, extends to all men (in the same sense as the original and subsequent promises, and innumerable other blessings that perpetually flow from the Father of lights), justice is done to the universal mode of expression in the scripture-testimony, while it stands perfectly consistent with the sovereign *designation* of that price in the actual redemption of God's elect.

"If reconciliation is exhibited in the gospel-call to any who are not, and will not be, reconciled; if God is in Christ making a proposal of reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, it follows that the price of redemption has the extent above mentioned, in the plan of divine government. Again, if reconciliation to God is proposed, by the persuasions, intreaties, and affectionate importunities of his word and ambassadors, as it expressly and most evidently is, there must be a true and rational, as opposed to a fallacious and delusive, *ground* of reconciliation. And what can this be, but an INFINITE, and therefore *indefinite* PRICE? And, if God invites to the great supper 'the poor and the maimed, the halt and the blind,' yea, many who 'pray to be excused,' and who never come—the provision must, in all consistency and propriety of meaning, have been *rectorally designed* for them, in virtue of the great sacrifice; as much designed as a feast is for one who, being invited to partake of it, sends a message that 'he cannot come.'" *Essay on the Equity of Divine Government, and the Sovereignty of Divine Grace;* pp. 204–206, 3d ed. 1825.

A similar justness of combination we find in the writings of Calvin; whose fine judgment and noble impartiality as an expositor have drawn the admiration of many, who differ from some of his distinguishing sentiments. At the same time, these extracts show that he did not coerce himself to an anxious precision of phrase.

"In saying 'the sin of the world,' [the apostle] extends this favour without distinction to all mankind; that the Jews might not think that the Redeemer was sent for them only. The intention of the general expression, 'the sin of the world,' is to bring us to the feeling of our wretchedness, and excite us to seek the remedy. Our duty is to receive and hold fast this blessing which is offered to all; so that every man in particular may be assured that nothing can hinder from obtaining salvation by Christ, provided that he comes to Christ by faith." *On John* i. 29.

"The general word 'whosoever' is introduced, both to invite all men to the participation of this life, and to take away all excuse from unbelievers. The term 'the world' is used with the same design. For, while there is nothing to be found in the world worthy of the benignity and grace of God, he shows himself propitious to the whole world; wherefore, all men without exception are exhorted to believe in Christ." *On John* iii. 16.

The apostle "makes this blessing the common property of all, because it is presented to all; not that it is actually extended to all: for, though Christ suffered for the sins of the whole world, and is offered by the mercy of God to all without discrimination, yet all do not lay hold of him." *On Rom.* v. 18.

"This passage treats of classes of men, not individuals. It merely means that princes and foreign nations are included in the number" of those whom God invites to salvation. *On* 1 *Tim.* ii. 4.

To avoid the absurd inference of universal salvation, "the common interpretation is, that Christ suffered sufficiently for the whole world, but efficaciously for the elect only. This is true, but it does not apply to this passage. The design of the apostle John is, to show that this blessing belongs to the whole church. Therefore, under the word 'all,' he does not comprehend the reprobate; but respects those only who, though scattered through all quarters of the world, yet should believe." *On* 1 *John* ii. 2.

"As, by that inestimable pledge, the not sparing his own

Son, God showed how tenderly he regards the salvation of his church; so he will not permit the souls which he has redeemed by so great a price, to perish or to be exposed to become the prey of seducers, by the negligence of their pastors." *On* 2 *Tim.* iv. 1.

"When a weak conscience is wounded, the precious blood of Christ is wasted. It is to the last degree to be abhorred, that, for the gratification of a bodily appetite, such a soul should be lost." *On Rom.* xiv. 15.

In his commentary on Heb. ii. 9, the great Reformer does not touch upon the question.

Of the apostle Jude he says; "He means that Christ is denied, when those who had been redeemed by his blood, make themselves again the slaves of the devil; so that, as far as in them lies, they make null and void that price of incomparable value." *On Jude* 4.

In the remarkably pathetic "Testament and last Will," which Calvin dictated to a notary, the month before his death, he has this clause.—"With my whole heart I embrace the mercy which God has shown me for the sake of Jesus Christ, compensating for my sins by the merit of his death and sufferings; that thus satisfaction might be made for all my sins and offences, and their remembrance blotted out. I also testify and profess that I humbly supplicate him to accept me as washed and purified by the blood of that only Redeemer, shed for the sins of the human race [*effuso pro humani generis peccatis*], so that I may stand at his tribunal in my Redeemer's likeness."

To those who wish to see this great subject,—great in its collateral and consequent relations,—discussed in a manner very comprehensive and yet precise and full, in a candid spirit, and with the most important bearings on practical piety, I would earnestly recommend the following works: *On the Extent of the Atonement, in Relation to God and the Universe; by T. W. Jenkyn, D.D. third edition,* 1841; and *The Reconciler; on the Harmony and the Glory of the Divine Government and of the Divine Sovereignty; by the Rev. Robert Weaver,* 1841: a work in which, though this subject is not specifically introduced, the principles on which it requires to be discussed are patiently, piously, and judiciously considered. I would also observe that Dr Jenkyn is especially happy in treating the analogy between the ways of Providence and those of Redeeming grace.

Very masterly and lucid discussions of this subject and others allied to it, conducted in the most amiable and Christ-like temper, are Dr Wardlaw's *Discourses on the Nature and Extent of the Atonement of Christ;* Glasg. 1844; and the publications, brief indeed but richly comprehensive, of the lamented Dr Balmer and Dr John Brown, the Theological Professors in the United Secession Church, *Statements, etc. on certain Doctrinal Points;* Edinburgh, 1841,–4, and –5.

NOTE XXII.—page 74.

ON ARCHBISHOP MAGEE'S WORK ON ATONEMENT AND SACRIFICE.

He who publishes on any subject which has been ably treated by another, owes to the public an exposition of his reasons: and to bring out a pamphlet, as a discussion of a topic which has well filled large volumes, appears to require some apology. The common pleas, that every man has his circle in which he may expect more attention than another, and that the same truths may usefully be treated in different ways, are not admissible in every case. I therefore feel it incumbent on me to add this note in reference to a work deservedly held in high estimation; *Discourses and Dissertations on the Scriptural Doctrines of Atonement and Sacrifice; by the late Archbishop of Dublin.* 2 vols.

On the publication of the improved edition of Dr Magee's work, in 1809, I read it with much interest and general acquiescence. When my reverend brethren appointed me to preach on the Sacrifice of Christ, the recollection of that work was of course excited; and I could not but feel some anxiety lest, on the one hand, I should tread the round of apparent imitation; or, on the other, seem to affect a puerile originality, by the solicitous avoidance of sentiments already so well expressed and defended.[1] To escape this dilemma, the sermon was prepared and preached without once referring to Dr Magee's book: and, when the requisition to publish obliged me to revise and transcribe it, I observed the same caution till the whole discourse, and a considerable part of these notes, were written.

---

[1] Vetera et scripta aliis? parata inquisitio, sed onerosa collatio. Intacta et nova? graves offensæ, levis gratia. *Plin. Ep.* v. 8.

I then carefully perused the valuable work mentioned, with a view to ascertain the kind of comparison which I might presume my own little production would bear to it. The subject being the same, it was next to impossible that a sameness should not appear in some leading ideas: but, upon the whole, I found the points of resemblance to be few, and a considerable difference apparent in the plan, the mode of discussion, and the doctrinal deductions. The following will, I trust, be found a correct statement of the result of comparison.

1. *Coincident topics.* The antiquity and universality of SACRIFICES.—Not of human invention, but of divine institution.—Apparently unreasonable, irrespectively of the revealed import.—Figurative and symbolical.—Their actual significancy.—Designed as typical annunciations of the great object of the Messiah's mission.—His sacrifice alone possessed of intrinsic value and efficacy.—The mediatorial scheme originating in the Divine benevolence;—and agreeable to the general sense and conduct of mankind.

2. *Apparent differences.* In this Discourse, I have bound myself to a rigid strictness of method; not only with a design to render the object of the whole, and the relation of the parts, more obvious; but with an especial wish to expose every sentiment and argument to the fullest examination. Dr Magee's Two Discourses are composed with greater freedom in this respect: and the Seventy-six Dissertations, appended to successive parts of the text, are not arranged in the logical order of the argument, and evidently bear no relation of series to each other.

To theological sentiments, distinct from the general subject, Dr Magee has but sparing and brief allusions: so that it would be presumptuous to form a decided opinion as to his approval of the views of Christian doctrine advanced in these pages, or his dissent from them. I fear, however, that some passages in his work indicate a material difference from those views which I think it my duty to maintain, upon the real value of the Redeemer's sacrifice,—its relation to the moral attributes and government of God,—its connexion with the Divine Nature of Christ,—its efficacy,—and its application.

3. *Topics in Dr Magee not adverted to, or but slightly, in this Discourse.* These are chiefly in the Dissertations, which extend to 825 pages, and, though perhaps too desultory, contain a treasure of information, reasoning, and criticism. Many of

them are upon different lights and bearings of the same subject: so that the following, though a concise, will not, I hope, be found an incomplete enumeration.—The inefficacy of repentance and human works to procure pardon.—Multiplied objects of single divine acts.—Prayer.—Divine origin of human speech.—Date of the permission to use animal food.—Disquisitions on the sacrifices of Abraham and of Job:—the command to sacrifice Isaac:—the history and criticism of the Book of Job: —the diversities of the Levitical sacrifices:—the theories of sacrifice maintained by different authors.—Many valuable criticisms and comments on scripture.—Remarks on the objections, doctrines, and writings of Deists, Unitarians, Socinians, Arians, and the supporters of the schemes of Grotius, Spencer, and Warburton.

4. *Topics in this Discourse not included in Dr Magee's plan.* These may be generally stated as the whole of the reasonings and observations from p. 42, to the end of the Discourse.—In Notes I. and III. I had collected some of the instances which Dr Magee had adduced; but, on comparison with his Dissertations, I have omitted them, and added a reference to his work. The passage from Cicero (*pro Fonteio*), he mentions, but does not insert. If there be any other coincidence, it has escaped my observation.

Upon the whole, I flatter myself that, in the collation of this Discourse with the Archbishop's large and valuable work, there will be found as few resemblances as could be expected in two discussions of the same subject, and professedly drawn from the same sources of original authority.

The reader will perceive that this Note refers to the first edition, in 1812, of the *First* of the preceding Discourses. To the present publication it is less relevant; but I conceived myself not to be at liberty to suppress it.

NOTE XXIII.—page 100.

CITATION FROM DR RYLAND.

"The Reasonableness of the Doctrine of Christ's Mediation and Satisfaction, as agreeing in some measure with the feelings and conduct of men —If a person very dependent and deeply indebted, should injure and abuse you, and obstinately persist in so doing, notwithstanding all you could do to reclaim him, convince him, or win him by new obligations; surely he might go on so long in this course that you would afterwards be unwilling to forgive him (unless upon religious, evangelical considerations" [such, for instance, as those derived from my consciousness of my own offences against God, and his infinite grace in forgiving me, no analogy to which can be transferred to the Divine Being;]—), "even though he should leave off his evil practices, and ask pardon. But, if a much dearer friend who had always been true to that character, and was a near relation of the offender, should intercede for him, put himself to much expense, labour, and difficulty, and undergo great hardships and sufferings, to procure his forgiveness at your hands; and if the person himself should change his mind, and beg pardon for the sake of this common friend:—who would not feel differently disposed, and ready to forgive him, for this intercessor's sake, though not for his own? Certainly, it is agreeable to the common feelings and practice of mankind, for those who are connected with a person of distinguished excellence and merit, to be treated differently, on account of that relation, to what they would have been had no such relation subsisted. Who is there that has a singular love and esteem for a parent, that would not value the children the more for his sake? (—David to Mephibosheth,—for Jonathan.—) And even more distant relations and friends; especially if it be known that the superior relation had a singular regard for the interest of the inferior, and would take what was done for him, as done to himself. So Paul for Onesimus; Philemon, verses 17, 19. In this case, one person is in some degree *substituted* for the other; his merit is as it were *imputed* to him and treated *as if* it belonged not only to the most worthy person, but also to his relation and friend. (—Jonathan and Mephibosheth.—) All this is the more conformed to our common ideas of propriety, *in proportion* to the nearness of *relation* between the parties, one of whom is supposed to recommend the other to favour; also the degree of *affection* by the superior to the inferior, and the *interest* he takes in his welfare, especially if he seriously and earnestly desire it, and that in such a degree as to be willing to promote or insure it at the greatest expense, by his own continued labour or extreme suffering. If he also apply particularly and earnestly to the person offended, whom he highly esteems, and who in the like manner has the highest value for him: and if he intercedes with him for the offender, whom he loves and pities, and whose cause he has made his own; yet *in such a way* as not to imply the slightest reflection on the offended, or any inclination to countenance the offender in his misconduct, to justify or excuse what he had done amiss. This must have the more weight, if all were conducted with such wisdom and decorum as would prevent any part of the transaction from lessening the idea of the mediator's virtue: or rather if it were so contrived as to be a wonderful display of virtue, an exhibition of uncommon excellence. (—Judah's plea for Benjamin.—) It would crown all if the mediator aimed as much at the reformation of the offender, as at the prevention of his punishment and ruin."

This venerable man, distinguished for his penetration and felicitous tact in metaphysical and moral questions, carries on the application of these hypothetical views to the Mediatorial character and work of Jesus Christ. He describes the *dignity* of this Saviour, yet his *close relation* to man;—his supreme respect to the *government* and *glory* of God, combined with the most tender regard to the happiness of man:—his *voluntariness* and *deep interest* in the whole engagement;—that his so interesting himself in favour of unworthy and guilty creatures, involved him in *no disgrace;* as would have been the case had he in the least palliated the conduct of sinners, or afforded any apology or countenance to sin, or implied any reflection upon the law or the Lawgiver;—that, in the whole arrangement and its execution, he gave the most impressive demonstration of his love to *moral order*, to holiness and justice;—that he made it essential to the enjoyment of an interest in his benevolent undertaking, that none can receive the benefit till they concur with him in his sentiments and feelings of loyalty to the divine government; accounting it equally a matter of happiness and blessing to become duteous subjects to the rule of eternal righteousness, as to be restored to the favour of God;—and that the *whole plan* of redemption and its application is infinitely *excellent* in the estimation of the Divine Father, and acceptable to all his glorious attributes.

PASTORAL MEMORIALS, *selected from the Manuscripts of the late Rev.* JOHN RYLAND, D.D., *in two volumes;* vol. i. p. 174–179. Dr Ryland died on May 25, 1825, aged 72.

NOTE XXIV.—page 145.

ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

I have copied the titles of these two elaborate and very important works, not because the brevity of the one stands in contrast to the amplitude of the other, but because the contents of the latter work are thus fully and clearly described. In a volume of 681 pages, the matter of which so greatly required a Table of Contents and an Index, it is disappointing to find neither. It may therefore be acceptable to my readers to receive a little information upon Mr Forster's plan. A general Introduction. "Sect. I. Identity of Manner between the Epistle to the Hebrews and St Paul's undisputed Epistles, in the *use of peculiar words.* Sect. II. Identity of Manner between etc. in the *use of the word καταργέω.* Sect. III. Tables of N. T. words *peculiar* to the Epistle to the Hebrews and the undisputed Epistles of St Paul; with their *parallel verbal dependencies.*" Fifty-five words are adduced, compared with every instance of occurrence, and followed by a large enumeration of phrases having affinity to the sentiment. Here we greatly want the author's explication of those affinities, for, in many cases, they are very obscure. "Sect. IV. Table of words *peculiar*" etc. *not found elsewhere,* in the N. T., the LXX., or the Apocrypha; "with their *parallel verbal dependencies.* Sect. V. Tables of Words *occasionally occurring elsewhere* in the N. T. but *in the manner or the frequency* of their occurrence, *peculiar* to the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the undisputed Epistles of St Paul. Sect. VI. Examination of some *leading parallel passages* in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the undisputed Epistles. Sect. VII. *Identity of manner* between etc. in the use of *favourite words.* Sect. VIII. Identity etc. in the habit of *going off at a word.* Sect. IX. In the use of *paronomasia.* Sect. X. *Quotations* and *modes* of quotation from the O. T. Sect. XI. In the use of *key-texts.*" By this term Mr Forster means the presentation of principal topics, to which others are subordinated. This truly difficult subject is treated at great length; but I am sorry to express my conviction that the author has run into serious errors, particularly in relation to the law of God and the justification of a sinner. "Sect. XII. Harmony of *parallel passages,*" —pursued to the largest extent, and presented in parallel columns. "Sect. XIII. *External Evidences.*" Here Mr Forster investigates very fully the allusions and references to be found in the Apostolic Fathers, the testimony of Pantænus, and the opinions of Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. "Sect. XIV. Arg. from 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16, and other clauses in the Epistles of Peter."

A summing up or analytical synopsis of this extensive series would have materially increased the value of the work. But let us be thankful for what we have. It places in a strong and convincing light the many and satisfactory reasons for the conclusion which it announces. For that conclusion, the positive internal evidence is amply sufficient.

The learned author does not refrain from examining the external side of the question; and he brings under review the objections of several, and those eminent divines and expositors. But this is not done completely. Mr Forster has not thought it worth his trouble and time to pay any attention to the writings of the recent German critics on this much agitated question; indeed, for aught that appears, he has not studied their language. This is a serious deficiency to a scholar in the present day. The German divines, the most temperate and judicious of them, would be struck with astonishment were they informed that one who stands high among us actually regards the *Introduction* of Michaelis, as translated by Marsh, to furnish a sufficient representation of the literature of their country upon this subject!

But this deficiency has been well supplied by Professor Stuart. He does not even go back at all to the opinion and reasoning of Michaelis; no doubt regarding him in this matter as completely superseded by the far more comprehensive and penetrating disquisitions of long subsequent writers, who have collected and displayed, with consummate ability, all that previous writers had said against the Pauline authorship of the epistle. Mr S. has given their objections and hypotheses in the most full and honourable manner, and has brought them to the test of a thorough examination. He knows the learning and ability of those men too well, to think himself entitled to dispose of them, as our countryman does, by a small sarcasm. He has therefore thus patiently adduced and subjected to a candid, good-tempered, and yet strict scrutiny, all that has been advanced (with no small measure of learning and ability) by Bertholdt, Schulz, Seyffarth, De Wette, Böhme, Mynster, Eichhorn, and Bleek. Of the last-mentioned author, whose two disquisitions upon these subjects were published in about 1828 and 1832, Professor Stuart, with his characteristic honour, says,—"This writer may be reckoned among the first class of German critics, in respect to learning and diligence. I add with great pleasure also, that he has, in most cases, conducted his arguments with a good degree of moderation and candour, and is free from a censorious spirit."

Mr Stuart's examination of all the evidence, internal and external, is most patient, thorough-going, impartial, and conscientious. The kind of evidence which Mr Forster has detailed with such a fulness and minuteness that leave us nothing to desire, had also received a close and masterly attention from the learned and pious American. He carries on a "Comparison of the Phraseology and Diction of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and of the acknowledged Epistles of Paul," under three heads of *similarities* and *peculiarities*, followed by logical argument of which the result, if I may conceive myself capable of understanding and estimating moral evidence, is a demonstration as complete as rational criticism admits of, that PAUL *and no other* was the writer of this Epistle.

The results of Mr Stuart's laborious investigation may be given in the following citations from his work.

"The *early* testimony is, of course, immeasurably the most important. And there seems to me sufficient evidence, that this was as general and as uniform, for the first century after the apostolic age, as in respect to many other books of the New Testament; and more so than in respect to several. I cannot hesitate to believe, that THE WEIGHT OF EVIDENCE FROM TRADITION, IS ALTOGETHER PREPONDERANT IN FAVOUR OF THE OPINION, THAT PAUL WAS THE AUTHOR OF OUR EPISTLE. —The historical evidence against the Pauline origin of our Epistle is, as we have seen, so little, so vague, and, for the most part, so indirect, that we may well say, *The objections have never been of an historical nature, but of a conjectural one.* They have arisen more from taste and feeling,—or from the exigencies of religious dispute,—than from tradition or testimony. On the whole, I must acquiesce in the opinion of Origen, which I repeat as the general voice of antiquity. IT IS NOT WITHOUT REASON, THE ANCIENTS HAVE HANDED IT DOWN TO US, THAT THIS EPISTLE IS PAUL'S." Pp. 119, 253; sec. ed. Andover, 1833.

It is just and important to cite the following passage of Mr Forster. "In thus alluding to the name of Professor Stuart of Andover, in the United States of N. A., I am bound to add that, while I have seen incidentally, with sincere and solid satisfaction, more than one independent coincidence between our respective arguments in support of the received title, I have purposely denied myself the gratification of perusing his learned work on the Epistle to the Hebrews, until the present volume should be before the public. I have done so, in order that the subject may have the benefit of whatever advantages may arise from the concurrences between two wholly independent arguments; the entire argument of my work having been prepared several years previously to the appearance of Professor Stuart's volume." P. 25.

An argument in favour of this Epistle being a genuine work of Paul, has been proposed, and supported with great ability, some years ago, by the Rev. Frederick Christian Gelpke, Pastor of the Lutheran Church at Wermsdorf in Saxony. It is entitled to at least respectful attention, and I confess that to me it appears to rise high on the scale of moral evidence.

Among the inventive compositions which were frequent in the third century, with both Gentiles and Christians, and which were often rhetorical exercises, rather than intended to be put off as genuine; there are fourteen epistles, purporting to be a correspondence between the apostle Paul and the philosopher Seneca, when the one was suffering his two years of gentle imprisonment in Rome (Acts xxviii. 30), and the other was enjoying his flourishing days of riches and honour in the same city. It is consonant with the laws of human intellect and with facts in literary history, that supposititious writing indicates the verity of some real historical occurrences as furnishing its basis or occasion. Passages of Jerome and Augustine, in the fourth century, speak of it as an acknowledged fact that some intercourse took place between Paul and Seneca, in the time and opportunity referred to. Even Justus Lipsius, whose prejudices were likely to have borne him in the opposite direction, regards such intercourse, personal or epistolary or both, as so probable, that it would be boldly absurd to question it.[1] In the lucid Dissertation of Mr Gelpke,[2] coincidences are brought forwards, of *sentiment*, *language*, and *method*, between the Epistle to the Hebrews and several of the writings of Seneca, especially his treatise (written as an epistle to Lucilius) on Providence. The passages adduced and brought into juxta-position are so numerous, and their mutual affinities are so marked, as to be quite unaccountable, except on the supposition of an extensive interchange of sentiment and discussion between the writers. Gallio, the Proconsul of Achaia, who had been in a measure the protector of Paul at Corinth (Acts xviii. 12–17), was Seneca's brother: and the Præfect of the palace (called in our version "captain of the guard"), to whose official custody the apostle was consigned on his arriving at Rome as a state prisoner under appeal to the Emperor (Acts xxviii. 16), was Burrhus, an intimate friend of Seneca. Thus, there were probable causes, private and personal, for the excitement of the philosopher's curiosity and motives superior to mere curiosity, to become acquainted with the doctrines of the extraordinary man whose teachings had produced such effects over large districts of the empire, that he and his companions were, by their adversaries, declared to "have turned the world upside down," and, in other places, were taken to be the gods of Olympus.

Another consideration is, that Seneca's philosophy was the Stoic; and he might soon and easily discover that the doctrines of the Jewish teacher upon the moral and physical government of the Supreme Mind, had a striking affinity to his own. The many sublime truths of theology, comprised in the Stoical system, are well displayed by the learned Thomas Gataker in his Preface to his Antoninus, of which a good abstract is prefixed to Simpson's Epictetus, Cebes, and Theophrastus. That the distinguishing doctrines of Christianity were to the Roman Philosopher "a stumbling-block and foolishness," there is too much reason to believe: but he might make many visits to Paul's "hired lodging," and contract a feeling of reverence and admiration for the man in whom shone such noble qualities; before he had proceeded to the length of finally rejecting the Gospel. His own theology was Pantheistic; his sublime of virtue was proud contempt of pain, or to end it by self-murder; his fortune was splendid, and he contradicted his philosophy by his avarice; but he was a man of mild and gentle manners, his thirst for knowledge was insatiable, and with good reason it may be supposed that whatever he had heard casually and imperfectly of Christianity he found to have so many points of affinity with his many excellent sentiments, as to create a strong desire to obtain a further acquaintance with it. It would have been much more surprising, if the author of the *Natural Questions*, who took so vast a range in physical inquiries, and drew from them moral reflections of exquisite beauty (cap. vii. § 30), had felt no desire to draw knowledge from the Jewish sage. Inviting opportunity existed. During a period which might extend over many months, Seneca had it in his power to hold high converse with the Christian prisoner, and could scarcely avoid the acquiring of something from the riches of divine philosophy.

---

[1] In the Dedication of his edition of Seneca, to Pope Paul V., and in his *Prolegomena*, p. xxv.

[2] *Vindiciæ Originis Paulinæ ad Hebr. Epist.* Leyden, 1832.

If this hypothesis be accepted, a just and reasonable cause is found of those coincidences in sentiment and phraseology which so abundantly exist; but which, without such an hypothesis, must appear unaccountable. Godfrey Less, a man whose learning and piety rendered him a worthy judge, in an unfinished work (über die Religion, ihre Geschichte, Wahl, und Bestätigung, I. 193), *on Religion, its History, Selection, and Establishment*, thus writes upon the remarkable points of resemblance between the Epistle to the Hebrews and Seneca's Treatise on Providence; "If this book was actually written by Seneca, and has received no interpolations, he must have read the Epistle to the Hebrews. For indeed one may well suppose that a philosopher, a man of extensive reading, and living in Rome, where was a Christian church so considerable as to have become an object of attention to Nero, would not fail to see the writings of that community." Cited by Gelpke, p. 49.

The Christian scholar will be well rewarded for reading Seneca's treatise, by the many admirable sentiments which he will find, and often most happily expressed notwithstanding a little affectation of point and contrast. In relation to the present argument, the observance of coïncidences will be found very striking. But the perusal of Mr Gelpke's work will, if I mistake not, be eminently satisfactory, by its luminous treatment of the books compared, by its clear and candid argumentation, and even by its being, to a considerable extent, a commentary upon the Epistle. He shows, to my conviction, that the position which, on various grounds he establishes, of the connexion between Paul and Seneca, obviates many difficulties which have been brought as objections to the Epistle; and brings a moral proof of great cogency that none but Paul could be its author.

Neither Mr Stuart nor Mr Forster could be acquainted with this interesting treatise, as their works were written, if not printed, before it was published: and Gelpke's earlier work had certainly not come to their knowledge, as very few copies were printed, and those were chiefly distributed among the author's friends. It was entitled, *An Investigation of the Probability of the Intercourse traditionally affirmed to have taken place between the Apostle Paul and Seneca the Philosopher.*[1]

Another and that very important contribution to the evidence on the great question has been made by a person from whom it might little have been expected, and whose suffrage as an argument from probability is of value, because his predilections were likely to have borne his judgment in the opposite direction. He is no other than the greatest surviving patriarch of the German Anti-supernaturalists, Henry Eberhard Gottlob Paulus. In 1833, he published *The Admonitory Writing of the Apostle Paul to the Hebrew Christians; faithfully translated, with Elucidatory Parentheses, a Continuous Exposition, a Critical Introduction, and Observations on Difficult Passages.*[2] He discusses "the Origin of the Epistle" at great length, and with a remarkable acuteness and penetration. He is particularly happy in treating the differences in the choice of words, and the style which are observable in a comparison with the other Epistles of Paul; and accounts for them by estimating the very different state of mind in which the apostle could not but be, in reference to the occasion and design of this *treatise* or even *oration*, rather than epistle, as compared with the others. He pictures the apostle as pouring forth the stream of holy eloquence, with a power and fervour unrivalled, till he has comprehended all his objects. In a few sentences at the close of the address, he comes down to the epistolary style. Dr Paulus conjectures that Luke employed the pen in writing down the speech which thus flowed from his great companion's animated lips. He observes,—"Very different from each other are a dictated letter, and an address of exhortation which had before been perfectly thought over, its plan systematically sketched, and then the whole committed to writing. From this very different ground-work, origination, and design, the great difference, impossible to be mistaken, between the apostle's letters and this *Paraclesis*, is perfectly explicable, and is founded in the very nature of the case. The much more definite and precise arrangement of the whole body of materials, and the selection of the most expressive Greek words, are plainly manifested: the rounding of the periods is as certainly in this case characteristic, as the exquisite invention and the ample unfolding of the arguments, particularly from the application of Old Testament passages. But all this shows only the difference between what Paul could effect when merely dictating a letter, and when composing a methodical deduction according to a settled plan. On the other hand, the matter contained, down to the smallest particulars, is *all so genuinely Pauline*, that certainly no other person, if even the apostle had furnished him with the sentiments, could possibly have introduced so much of the characteristic peculiarity." *Introd.* p. xxi.

---

[1] *De Familiaritate quæ Paulo Apostolo cum Seneca philosopho intercessisse traditur, Verisimillima.* Leipzig, 1813.

[2] Des Apostels Paulus Ermahnungs-Schreiben an die Hebräer Christen; wortgetreu übersetz, mit Erläuternden Zwischensätzen, einer fortlaufenden Sinnerklärung, kritischen Einleitung, und Bemerkungen über schwerere Stellen. Heidelberg, 1833.

This Introduction occupies sixty-four large pages: but it would be impossible for me to do it justice by any abstract, and to insert the whole would be manifestly improper. The reader will not forget that it expresses the judgment of a man who has distinguished himself by rejecting to a great extent, though not so far as some of his more daring followers, the miraculous facts and most essential doctrines of Christianity. The peculiar value of his declarations on the authenticity of the Epistle to the Hebrews, lies in their being the results of an investigation merely literary and critical, and to which his general prepossessions were little likely to have disposed him.

This note may have appeared tedious; but, considering the weight of talent and of illustrious names which have been arrayed against the reception of this Epistle as of Paul, it is important to have the mind settled upon good grounds in a conviction of its being the genuine work of the Apostle of the Gentiles, the product of inspiration, and stamped with the authority of heaven.

NOTE XXV.—page 187.

ON THE CONNEXION OF THE IDEAS OF RANSOM AND ATONEMENT.

In the passage here quoted, Egypt is said to become the ransom (כֹּפֶר *kopher*) for the Jewish nation; as the course of calamitous events which appeared impending over the latter, was averted; and, by the remarkable providence of God, was made to fall upon the former. The same idea occurs in two passages of the Proverbs. "The righteous is delivered out of trouble, and the wicked cometh in his stead." xi. 8. "The wicked is a *ransom* (*kopher*) for the righteous, and the transgressor instead of the upright." xxi. 18. Frequently, in the Book of Psalms, it is made an observation upon the conduct of Providence, that "the wicked fall into the pit which they have digged," that the mischievous devices which they had planned against the servants of God, are not only frustrated, but fall back upon the heads of their authors. So Haman came to the wretched end which he had prepared for Mordecai; and the accusers of Daniel were thrown to the lions' den, out of which he had been delivered. Such instances may be deemed moral elucidations of the words (כָּפַר *kaphar* and its cognate forms) so often occurring in the Old Testament, to denote the *pardon of sin*, *deliverance from its consequences*, and the *means of obtaining* those results.

The primary meaning of the verb is *to cover*, *to draw over*; and, in the conjugation of *pihel*, it acquired the significations *to forgive* (as it were, to *cover* an offence), and to *do any act* which should be the *cause* or *occasion* of forgiveness; and thence, by a further process in the flow of ideas, *to compensate*, *to expiate*, *to propitiate*, and *to accept an expiation*: and these senses passed on to the cognate noun. Jacob's hope, under the alarming anticipation of meeting his brother, was, "I will *propitiate* (*akapperah*) his presence with a gift." Gen. xxxii. 21. The owner of a vicious bull, who had neglected to confine the dangerous beast, if a person was gored to death by it, forfeited his own life; but the law allowed him to redeem himself by a money payment, and this *payment* was called a (כֹּפֶר) *kopher*: Ex. xxi. 31. In the same sense it occurs in Ps. xlix. 8. "By no redemption can a man redeem his brother, nor give to God a *ransom* for him." So likewise, Job. xxxiii. 24. "Redeem him from going down to the grave, I have found a *ransom*."

The poll-tax of half a shekel for every Israelite, was called "the *atonement*-money" (*keseph-hakkippurim*), and was declared to be "a heave-offering to Jehovah, to *propitiate* (*kapper*) for their lives." Ex. xxx. 12–16. The formula, expressing the design of the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings, occurs many times in the prescriptions of the law concerning sacrifices;—"The priest shall *propitiate* for him, on account of his sin; and it shall be forgiven him:" Lev. iv. v. etc. and see the Extracts from Winer, p. 223, 226, of this volume. This is also particularly expressed in the law relating to the great annual "day of *propitiations*" (Lev. xxiii. 27, 28), and, after several repetitions, it comes thus, as a solemn close; "He shall *propitiate* for the holy of holies; and for the tabernacle of the congregation, and for the altar, he shall *propitiate;* and for the priests, and for all the people of the assembly, he shall *propitiate:* and this shall be to you for a statute for ever, to *propitiate* for the children of Israel, on account of all their sins, once in a year." ch. xvi. 10, 17, 27, 34. Another illustrative example occurs in Deut. xxi. 8. "Accept the *expiation* for thy people Israel, O Jehovah!" In the same sense it is used, in the remarkable predictions of Ezekiel; ch. xliii. 20, 26. xlv. 17.

Among the predictions of the divine judgments upon Babylon, we find,—"Evil shall come upon thee, thou shalt not know its dawning; and destruction shall fall upon thee, thou shalt not be able to *propitiate* it." Is. xlvii. 11. In a similar sense the word occurs in Prov. xvi. 14. "The wrath of a king is as messengers of death; but a wise man will *propitiate* it."

The verb also occurs in the reflexive sense, expressing the gracious purposes of Jehovah to show mercy to his repentant and reformed people; "He will be *propitious* to his land, his people." Deut. xxxii. 43.

In all these applications, we may trace the reigning idea of *preventing*, *averting*, or *removing* some *consequence*, which would otherwise fall upon a person or other object; and the mode of effecting the purpose is by *producing a change*, sometimes in the *agent*, sometimes in the *act*, and sometimes in the *patient;* whence arise the various forms of expression above cited.

The covering or lid of "the ark of the covenant," or, as it is in other places called, "the ark of the testimony," overlaid with gold, and upon which the cherubic figures were fixed, was called (כַּפֹּרֶת *kapporeth*, rendered by the LXX. *ἱλαστήριον*· see p. 40 of this volume) the *propitiatory*, or *mercy-seat:* for upon it the symbolical blood of expiation was sprinkled, in the awful ceremonies of the "day of propitiations;" and from it God declared his benignity and authority to his people, his acceptance of their homage, and his will to bless them. "I will meet with thee there, and I will speak to thee, from above the *mercy-seat*, from between the two cherubim which are over the ark of the testimony, concerning all that I shall enjoin thee for the children of Israel." Ex. xxv. 22. The whole scenery of this divinely appointed symbol, so closely connected with the presentation of sacrifices under the declared intention of obtaining the pardon of sins, thus appears in concurrence with all the other cases described in the passages above quoted: clearly conveying the sentiment that a dreaded *consequence* was *averted* by a *substitution*, either of a ransom-price, or a slain sacrifice; or of one person for another, by a providential interference.

Thus did the wisdom of divine institutions impearl in the hearts and the understandings of men, the great idea of SALVATION from sin and misery, through the means of a RANSOM, a SUBSTITUTION, an EXPIATION; of value equal to the greatness of the occasion, and the dignity of HIM that ordained, and of HIM that achieved it.

"He loved us, and sent his own Son, a propitiation for our sins.—Christ,—by his own blood, hath entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For, if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the defiled, sanctified to the purity of the body; HOW MUCH MORE shall the blood of CHRIST, who, through the ETERNAL SPIRIT, offered himself spotless to God, purify your conscience from dead works, TO SERVE THE LIVING GOD!"

NOTE XXVI.—page 180.

Referring to the whole of Discourse III.

CITATION FROM MICHAELIS ON THE PECULIARITY OF OUR LORD'S SUFFERINGS.

In a work[1] which, with many singularities, possesses remarkable interest, the distinguished critic, Sir John David Michaelis, examines the question whether, in human judicatures, a transfer of punishment from the guilty to the innocent be practicable, to the advantage of all parties and with the preservation of all moral rights; and he concludes in the negative. His discussion then proceeds :—

---

[1] Gedanken über die Lehre der Heiligen Schriften von Sünde und Genugthuung, als eine der Vernunft gemässe Lehre. *Thoughts on the Doctrine of*

—"If all these causes which, in human jurisprudence, forbid the transfer of punishments, fail to be applicable to the doctrine of the Satisfaction of Christ, it by no means follows, that there is no ground for regarding that doctrine as consistent with reason; for considerations exist with regard to the exercise of judicial authority in God, which are impossible in relation to human judgments.

"I will repeat the conditions which have been before stated, and consider minutely and circumstantially their application to the satisfaction of Christ.

"It is not a case of transfer of penalty that is factitious, or existing only in appearance; but it was an actual, real, and earnest enduring of penalty.

"This is plainly laid down in Scripture. According to its testimony, Christ though a real man was absolutely sinless, and therefore was not, on his own account, under the smallest obligation to suffer any penal infliction: but, on account of his transcendent purity, and his superiority to all other human beings; yea more, on account of the union of his human nature with the divine, he had a right to expect every possible kind of joy, happiness, and honour. Yet, instead of that, his lot was entire and unmerited suffering. Consonant with this fact, the Scripture informs us that he felt his sufferings with the most exquisite sensibility, and that he shuddered at their dreadful access: it exhibits him as not in the smallest degree intoxicated with the enthusiastic ambition of a renowned martyrdom; nor as being so supported by the Deity as to have been borne above the feelings of pain. It appears also that, during a portion of time comprising his severest agonies, he did not enjoy any prospect into futurity, which would have been a foretaste of the glorious reward set before him, and by the hope of which he might have been compensated for the sufferings which he endured. To support this by adducing passages of the Bible, is not my present concern: it belongs to doctrinal theology. My object is merely to inquire whether

the Holy Scriptures concerning Sin and Satisfaction, as a Doctrine agreeable to Reason. Göttingen, 1779. Pages 646-655.

this doctrine, as it stands in the Bible, is agreeable to the previously established principles of reason.

"Certainly, no injustice was done to our Redeemer. He had, as the Bible describes him, the most magnanimous willingness, unflinching to the very last, perfectly rational, and arising from no enthusiasm: a willingness to undergo our penalties, in order, by a short-lived evil to prevent a much greater, even the eternal evil of the whole human race.—A summary of the chief passages in the Bible upon this subject may be given in the following four propositions.

"1. The willingness of Jesus to undergo the long foreseen suffering, had endured for a considerable number of years, down to the moment of his actual entrance into his most painful sorrows.

"2. It was not a mere passive submission, but a zealous desire and longing, to fulfil this will of God, though so painful.

"3. It was not compelled or extorted by any irresistible will on the part of God. On the contrary, Jesus himself declared, in the commencement of his sufferings, that he could pray to his Father to be delivered from the power of his enemies, and that God would grant his prayer. Matt. xxvi. 53, 54.

"4. Thus the conduct of Jesus was at the utmost possible remove from anything enthusiastic, and did not at all border upon the delirium of a desire for martyrdom, which might have produced some degree of insensibility to pain. Jesus experienced, long beforehand, a perfect horror at the greatness of his sufferings. So strongly did he feel this, as to be extremely displeased when Peter made objections to his undertaking those sufferings; just as if those objections were actually a temptation, which might make an undue impression upon his heart. Matt. xvi. 21–23. He was extremely distressed at the prospect of his approaching sufferings: 'Now is my soul troubled: and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour!—' John xii. 27, 28. Certainly that was not the tone of an enthusiastic martyr. And finally, he prayed to God, that, if it were possible (that is, hypothetically possible, and so that the great end might not fail to be secured), this suffering,—I presume not to say whether he meant the whole or an extremely insupportable part of it,—might pass from him. Matt. xxvi. 37–44.

"To one who, in this persevering and rational manner, is willing to bear anything, certainly no injustice is done when his will is accomplished: especially when the object of his will is so rational as, by an evil of short continuance which he alone endures, to redeem countless millions from eternal evil impending over them; thus diminishing the whole sum of evil.

"At the same time God had destined for him a reward so glorious (— of which indeed the prospect, or the certainty, seems to have been withdrawn from him in the greatest depth of his suffering, and instead thereof a dismal uncertainty with regard to the issue of the cause appears to have entered his mind—), that no man can avoid esteeming Jesus, as he is described in the Bible, to be happy, notwithstanding his sufferings. Thus another ground is discovered, which extinguishes the imputation of injustice.

"How this willingness arose in the mind of Jesus, the Bible gives us no further information: but a kind of natural foundation for it is to be found in the heart of man." The author refers to another part of his book, in which he treats upon *sympathy* as a natural property of mankind, producing, when not as it were cauterized by extreme wickedness or by habit, excessive and intolerable pain in seeing another person tortured or put to a cruel death: producing also, in a virtuous and tender mind, a spontaneous delight in contemplating the happiness of another, especially if it be sudden, and in remarkable contrast with a former condition, and with a still higher delight if we ourselves have been the means of effecting it.— "This property of human tenderness and sympathy rises to a far higher pitch; as in the case of parental love. Good fathers and mothers think much less of their own sufferings than those of their children. In the human nature of our Redeemer, this quality of mind must have mounted to its highest degree, and have been the most perfect opposite to the accusation of the enemy of mankind: 'Skin for skin! All that men have, they will give for their lives. But stretch out thy hand now, and touch him to the quick, on his body; and I swear to thee that to thy very face he will renounce thee.' (Job ii. 4.) Of which the sense is, that man has no feeling for the sorrows of others, even his own children, if but his own body is without smart; a cold-hearted, selfish animal.

"The vicarious suffering laid upon Christ, is as much adapted to deter from sin, as if every sinner of the human race were to suffer in his own person and for ever. It will be readily admitted that a penal suffering is affecting and impressive, in proportion to the character and dignity of the person on whom it is inflicted. Even among men, though by nature perfectly equal, and one higher and another lower merely by quite accidental circumstances, yet this arbitrary and changeable condition produces a great difference in regard to the effect of punishments. The same penal suffering, inflicted upon a person of very high rank, is certainly more powerful in deterring from transgression, than if it fell upon a hundred poor peasants.[1] This common sentiment goes so far that, universally and without any partiality or culpable respect of persons, men have regard for station; so that, for the same crime, a less severe punishment is inflicted upon a very exalted person, than is upon a far inferior, and yet the two punishments are held to be equal.

"Moral beings of higher or lower nature than we are, I have not before my eyes; and I pretend not to lay down any ratio of estimation upon their difference."—Yet Michaelis goes on to argue from the fact that men would rightly prefer to save the life of a fellow-creature by giving up that of many of the brute creation, and from the ordination of Providence that the life and comfort of man, and indeed of the lower animals, are maintained at the cost of life to innumerable millions of other inferior creatures.

—"But now, let a man lay together and weigh against each other, a penal suffering upon such a person as the Bible describes Christ to be, and a penal suffering inflicted upon an ordinary man. He, being, by virtue of his union with the Divine Nature, exalted infinitely above us all, would be alone of more value than the whole human race, the dwellers on this little point of God's creation, the surface of our globe. Take which of the two you choose, a man who, without having seen the thing" [the fact of expiation by the Messiah], "believes the Bible; or some superior intelligence who believes it" [that fact], "not upon external testimony, but from his own knowledge; then, to either of these, a punishment, inflicted upon one who was GOD-MAN, would make the same, or even a still stronger impression, than a punishment inflicted upon the whole unhappy race of man. This last case of the infliction would indeed, in addition, have the appearance of cruelty, from the sad and pitiable condition of moral disease with which this whole race was affected without its own fault; and all the feelings of the spectator would rise against so severe an infliction of the threatenings of the law.

---

[1] This may have been true, sixty years ago, in Germany and even in Britain. But a more equitable order of sentiments happily now prevails. Yet the principle of the author's argument remains untouched. All history and experience prove it.

"In this way, the full execution upon Christ of the punishments due to us, demonstrates, in the strongest manner, the *indispensable* character of the punishments threatened on the part of God, and makes them in the highest degree adapted to deter from transgression. When, even in these most pitiable circumstances of the human race, God had determined that the penalties should absolutely not be remitted; when he hath inexorably inflicted them upon a person so dear to him as the Bible describes Christ to be, his own beloved Son; who could ever dare to expect the remission of the penalties, on the ground of mere repentance, though never so sincere and earnest, reformation, and the lowliest supplication?—Hath he sinned? Then he must make up his mind to feel the punishment himself: for neither man nor angel could ever hope for such a new and exalted Mediator, as would bear the punishments of sin in his stead.

"Thus, if we, for whom Christ has accomplished this *satisfaction*, do not in this life accept it under the conditions which God has fixed; if we do not here seriously and sincerely repent of our sins, and if we be not brought to an abhorrence and renouncing of sin through the sufferings laid upon Christ, as if they had been inflicted upon ourselves; we have nothing to expect in the world to come but irremissible punishment."—

This acute author afterwards discusses the probability, or rather certainty, that the whole work of Redemption by the Propitiatory Sufferings of Christ, is extensively made known to innumerable worlds of rational and accountable beings, superior to man: and from this he draws conclusions upon the benefits to countless numbers of superior intelligences, and through periods of duration and mundane revolutions spreading out to the vast future eternity, which accrue and will accrue, in preserving from sin and in furnishing motives and means for the highest holiness and happiness.

Since the publication of the former edition of this volume, I have enjoyed the happiness of witnessing the coming forth of several works upon the same and allied subjects, which have contributed to amplify their evidence, to place them in various and striking points of view, and to confirm their indefeasible relation to the whole circle of Christian Truth and Practical Piety. Among the American divines, the honoured names of BEECHER, WEST, WOODS, and MACILVAINE, have maintained their reputation and added new titles to our gratitude. Besides the British authors whose writings have been referred to in the preceding pages, I would especially recommend to every class of readers two large works; *The Nature, Reality, and Efficacy of the Atonement, by the Rev.* DANIEL DEWAR, *LL.D., Principal of Marischal College, Aberdeen;* Edinburgh, 1831.—And *A Treatise on the Doctrine of the Atonement, by the Rev.* CHARLES JERRAM, M.A., *Vicar of Chobham;* London, 1832. A most impressive representation of the practical influence of the doctrine is in Prof. THOLUCK's Letters, entitled *Guido and Julius* (über die Sünde und den Versöhner), *on Sin and the Propitiator*. We have an excellent translation of this volume, by J. E. Ryland, Esq. London, 1836. But it is much to be lamented that the too diffident translator feared that the Appendix of Dissertations would be too abstruse for English taste, and therefore did not annex them.

Other recent authors there are, I make no doubt, whose learned and pious labours have rendered services of no small importance to the illustration and enforcement of the awful question, *How may I be accepted into the eternal favour of God my Righteous Judge?* Among them, it will not, I trust, be deemed intrusive, if I especially mention the Irish clergymen, Dean O'BRIEN and Mr HIFFERNAN. May the predictions be fulfilled, in the best sense, "Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased! The knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea."

The original Text of the Passage from the Epistle to Diognetus, *introduced on the Page fronting the Commencement of Discourse I.*

*Ἐπεὶ δὲ πεπλήρωτο μὲν ἡ ἡμετέρα ἀδικία, καὶ τελείως, πεφανέρωτο, ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς * * * κόλασις καὶ θάνατος προσεδοκᾶτο· ἦλθε δὲ ὁ καιρὸς ὃν Θεὸς προέθετο, λοιπὸν φανερῶσαι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ χρηστότητα καὶ δύναμιν, ὡς * * * ὑπερβαλλούσης φιλανθρωπίας μία ἀγάπη * * * οὐκ ἐμίσησεν ὑμᾶς, οὐδὲ ἀπώσατο, οὐδὲ ἐμνησικάκησεν, ἀλλὰ ἐμακροθύμησεν, ἠνέσχετο, λέγων αὐτὸς, τὰς ἡμετέρας ἁμαρτίας ἀνεδέξατο· αὐτὸς τὸν ἴδιον υἱὸν ἀπέδοτο λύτρον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τὸν Ἅγιον ὑπὲρ ἀνόμων, τὸν Ἄκακον ὑπὲρ τῶν κακῶν, τὸν Δίκαιαν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδίκων, τὸν Ἄφθαρτον ὑπὲρ τῶν θνητῶν. Τί γὰρ ἄλλο τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἠδυνήθη καλύψαι, ἢ ἐκείνου δικαιοσύνη; Ἐν τίνι δικαιωθῆναι δυνατὸν τοὺς ἀνόμους ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀσεβεῖς ἢ ἐν μόνῳ τῷ Υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ; Ὢ τῆς γλυκείας ἀνταλλαγῆς· ὢ τῆς ἀνεξιχνιάστου δημιουργίας· ὢ τῶν ἀπροσδοκήτων εὐεργεσιῶν· ἵνα ἀνομία μὲν πολλῶν ἐν δικαίῳ ἑνὶ κρυβῇ, δικαιοσύνη δὲ ἑνὸς πολλοὺς ἀνόμους δικαιώσῃ.*

The asterisks mark the absence of some letters or words, through the corrosion or other obliteration in the ancient manuscripts : but the sense is not much interrupted.

APPENDIX,

REFERRING TO THE LETTERS OF MR VANCE SMITH.

In the year 1843, the Rev. George Vance Smith, B.A. (Unitarian minister at Macclesfield), published "Letters to the Rev. John Pye Smith, D.D., occasioned by the recent Republication of his Four Discourses," etc.

The object of that work is to represent, that I have utterly failed in proving the truth of the doctrines under consideration; and that such failure is consequent upon my having neglected to obtain an honest and fair understanding of the passages cited from the Scriptures, according to the established and rational rules of interpretation which we apply to the text of any ancient author: in other words, that, having assumed the point in debate, I have made up a collection of short passages as testimonies of the scriptural doctrine, detaching them from their proper connexion, and having no "due reference to the parties, institutions, circumstances, opinions, and prejudices, in connexion with which, often with direct and exclusive application to which, they were written."

To this observation I offer the following reply:—

The first of these Discourses was a sermon, preached and published in 1812; and neither the limits nor the character of a sermon admitted of critical disquisition. The doctrine was proposed in terms I hope sufficiently plain, and the applicableness of the citations I thought might fairly be left to the intelligence and, if need were, investigation of the reader. The means of such investigation are abundant and well known. I conceived that the terms of each passage generally conveyed its just interpretation; that, to have carried out a philological discussion, in the different instances, would have required a volume; and that, in subsequent parts of the work, aids to interpretation are given, which may suggest the resolution in particular cases.

Agreeing with Mr Vance Smith that, in order to the understanding of the speeches of Jesus and the writings of his apostles, we must take up a right conception of their circumstances, the errors which they opposed, and the prejudices they sought to rectify; I am at issue with him as to those things themselves, the very fountains of knowledge from which valid interpretation must flow. With him, so far as refers to an important part of the writings of the apostle Paul, sin and its guilt, redemption and righteousness, pardon, justification, and adoption, are terms relating solely to the ceremonial institutions of the Hebrews, their observance or their absence; the arrogant claims of the Jews and the Judaizing teachers; and the admission of Christian Gentiles into the kingdom of the Messiah, without passing through the gate of Mosaism. His theory is briefly represented in his own terse and lucid manner.

"Jesus the Messiah was a Jew, born 'under the law.' The law therefore forbade him from having friendly relations, in his character of Messiah, with any but Jews. Hence, none but Jews could legally become subjects of the Messiah, while himself was thus 'under the law.' Had Jesus, Hebrew as he was, continued to live, had he remained (as the Jews had expected Messiah would remain—John xii. 34) for ever in his mortal life, the Gentiles must still and for ever have remained 'without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel,' to which alone the mortal Messiah belonged. But Providence, in its mercy, had ordained that the kingdom of Christ should be enlarged, so as to admit the whole human race; that Jesus should be the Messiah, not merely of the one small Jewish nation, but of all the nations of the world. In order to the accomplishment, however, of this great design, it was necessary that Jesus should cease to be what he was, a Jew born 'under the law,' and forbidden by the law (which he came 'not to destroy but to fulfil') to have any intercourse with those who were, legally, in a state of sin. And how was this to be effected? How, but by his *death?* The apostle Paul writes, 'Know ye not, brethren, how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?' implying, and indeed stating immediately afterwards, that, when the man is dead, the law has no longer dominion over him. Hence, therefore, by his death Jesus became free from the bonds of the law.

"Christ, therefore, died to put himself, as it were, out of the jurisdiction of the law; so that all men, notwithstanding their state of legal condemnation and exclusion, might still become his subjects, by believing in him in his risen and glorified state (Rom. iv. 24; x. 9.). Thus Christ 'died for' all men:—*not* in their *stead*—*not* to bear the *punishment* of their sins, and thus to free them from it; but to place himself out of the reach of that law which, while he lived, had dominion over him (Acts x. 28, Rom. vii. 1), and intervened between him and those whom it condemned to exclusion from his kingdom. The connexion between the death of Christ and forgiveness of sins is, therefore, presented to us in two separate points of view. (1.) One has reference to the Gentiles alone: they were in a state of ceremonial disqualification for Messiah's kingdom, so long as Messiah himself was 'under the law;' but his death freed him from the law, and thus rendered that state of ceremonial disqualification of no importance. (2.) The other has reference to both Jews and Gentiles: both were in a state of moral guilt and condemnation through their sins; and hence, on principles of law, neither were admissible to Messiah's kingdom. But Messiah *died*, and thus put himself out of the jurisdiction of the law: hence the law had no longer dominion over him; and, therefore, though *it* condemned both Jew and Gentile, yet could *he* still receive them as his subjects. Thus, did his death *redeem* them from the state of condemnation and exclusion which, on principles of law, attached to them, and virtually effect remission of the sins by which that state was caused.

"The necessary and immediate consequence (in relation to the Gentiles) of our Lord's death and exaltation, was his release from those legal restraints which attached to him by birth, and prevented him, while in life, from being Messiah to any persons who were legally 'sinners.' It was, indeed, with the express design of breaking down the barrier, which, while he lived, kept off such persons from being his subjects, that he died; that is to say,—he '*died* FOR' such persons,—constituting, as they did, the whole Gentile world.

"—[In the sense just explained] Christ gave himself for the Ephesians (Eph. v. 2): But he was also 'an offering and a sacrifice to God.' Under the Mosaic dispensation, offerings and sacrifices to God were presented, in order to procure the removal of ceremonial uncleanness, or sinfulness. So, too, it is in the case of the annulment of the disqualification under which the Ephesians, as Gentiles, had laboured. The remission of *their* sins had its accompanying 'offering and sacrifice:' for, was it not by laying down his life, that Christ had brought about their admission into his kingdom? Thus was he, by the actual efficacy of his death, 'an offering and a sacrifice to God' for the Ephesians;—not *literally* so, it is manifest, for Christ was crucified as a criminal by Roman soldiers, not offered up, a victim upon the altar, by any priest,—'an offering and a sacrifice,' on presentation of which the disqualifying sins of the Ephesians were remitted. The figure,—if we remember who the writer was, a 'Hebrew of the Hebrews,' with his mind intimately familiar with the peculiar rites and ceremonies of his religion,—is an apt and forcible one. To interpret his words literally, is to destroy the beauty and force of the allusion. The expression is simply but one way of stating the great truth, that the death of the Messiah, by freeing *him* from the restraints of the law, admitted the Ephesians to be his subjects."—From pages 30–36.

I must acknowledge that this representation, in my judgment and feeling, bears the same relation to genuine Christianity that a skeleton hung up in a dissecting-room does to a living and healthy man. That in it which is true we already have; but its deficiency is infinitely lamentable.

That the Jewish people and their teachers, in the days of our Lord and his apostles, had extensively lost all right sentiment, in both understanding and heart, with respect to their national institutions, is abundantly clear from the whole New Testament. Their ancestors had set them the example, as we learn from Moses and the prophets. Their peculiar covenant they had long ago broken, and were therefore cast off already! Jerem. xxxi. 32. The religion of Jesus rejected the allurements to ambition, avarice, and all other vices, which their imaginations fastened upon the reign of the Messiah. Hence the teachings of Jesus and his authorised servants presented a contrast; *mental*, *spiritual*, *heavenly* enjoyments, as those which were to be looked for under that reign. It was to be received with dispositions the opposite of the national pride and perverted morality, founded on pharisaical traditions, and by which the "word of God was made of none effect." (Matt. xv. and Mark vii.) With equal unreasonableness and obstinacy the body of the unbelieving nation, and in coalition so far with them, the Judaical faction which professed a limited acknowledgment of Jesus as the Christ, sought to impose upon Gentile converts the peculiarities of the Mosaic law; but they showed their character, "the carnal mind, enmity against God," by merging the Moral Law in the ceremonial; the matter of immutable obligation in that which was emblematical (but whose instructive utility had now been superseded), temporary, and practicable only under local and intransferrible circumstances. The specific conditions of the Sinai covenant were such as might be perfectly fulfilled without a holy mind; they consisted only in obedience to outward observances, and they needed only earthly and selfish motives to govern that obedience. Let it, however, not be forgotten that the obligations of all moral obedience ran parallel with the subservient system; and that spiritual religion, founded on a right regard to God, with faith in the promised Messiah, not only existed, but in sincere hearts acquired vital strengthening from the obvious significancy of the sacrificial rites and their accompaniments. But this was nót to the taste of the Judaical teachers, who infested the first churches, and especially set themselves against Paul, depreciating his authority and maligning his person. Their chief point was, that the approbation and favour of God, for both the present life and the future, were secured by a sort of prescription to the descendants of Jacob; and that the same blessings were accessible to men of other ancestry only by their becoming Jewish proselytes. This state with respect to God was, in their eyes, Justification; and with it they combined the other blessings of the Divine favour, being children of God by Adoption and Sanctification: but all in a sense utterly foreign to spiritual piety and real virtue. This state of privilege was to be preserved by the Jews who already had it, and to be obtained as a new acquisition by the Gentiles who previously had it not, by submission to the *entire* law of Moses, the moral, the ceremonial, and even, as far as was practicable, the civil.

Against all this, the Christian doctrine was, that by deeds of law none of mankind could be justified (that is, obtain the blessings of the Messiah's regin, which were the forgiveness of sin and acceptance to the favour of God, with its proper concomitants); that all have become sinners, and have therefore precluded themselves from that favour; that the Mosaic law, taken in its widest amplitude, could not bring the great blessings which sinners need; that its ceremonial branch could only amount to an admission of sin, an acknowledgment of its desert, a memorial of the inadequacy to obtain the needed blessings, and a body of rites significant of the way to salvation, and pointing to it; and that the Moral Law, preceding, penetrating, and reigning over the ceremonial, stood as the faithful indictment against us, and the record of "the wrath of God against all ungodliness and unrighteousness." Thus, "by the law," taken in its largest comprehension, was "an acknowledgment of sin;" the moral law making apparent the wrongfulness, the inexcusableness, the dreadful desert, of sin; "the law worketh wrath,"[1] declaring the certain infliction of the deserved punishment: and the action of the ceremonial law coinciding with those intentions, the whole body of rites involved a continued "remembrance of sin;" and, at the same time, both proclaimed the inefficacy of its own painful and costly doings, and pointed to a real and infallible offering, to be made by Him who would "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."

Here, I conceive, lies the primary error of my able censor. He follows Dr John Taylor and others of eminent name, in reducing the most grand and valuable ideas of the Christian Religion to a few of what they have called "antecedent blessings," helps to salvation, but not indispensable, and to which applies Archdeacon Paley's unhappy avowal: "—Regenerate and born of the Spirit,—new creatures,—sons of God,—freed from sin and from death,—chosen,—and sealed, without a possibility of fall, unto final salvation. Such expressions of scripture—what do they mean?—Nothing;—nothing, that is, to us;—nothing to be found or sought for in the present circumstances of Christianity." (Visitation Sermon, at Carlisle, 1777; p. 15.)

This theory turns out of doors *the whole* Gospel of Christ, according to our conceptions of it. The being chosen, redeemed, pardoned, reconciled, justified, called, renewed, saints or holy persons, faithful children of God, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, saved by grace, brought nigh by the blood of

[1] "—Pœnam inde enasci:" *Morus.* "—produceth punishment:" *Mr Belsham.* Paraphrases; "The function of law lies in the determining of punishments:" *J. D. Michaelis.* "Those standing on the ground of law do not enjoy the peculiar favour of God, but are the objects of his wrath:" *Rev. Basil H. Cooper*, 1844. "Law, instead of rewarding men who transgress it, with an eternal inheritance of life, denounces only the wrath of God against them, and shows, by its rules of perfect rectitude, the extent of their offences and the heinous character of their disobedience."—*Rev. William Walford*, 1846.

Christ, the temple of God, the inhabitation of his Spirit, whose fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ;—the topics upon which the writers of the New Testament expatiate with their heavenly eloquence;—the glad tidings to all nations, to be announced in successive ages till the end shall come;—all is resolved into a deliverance from any obligation to observe "the mere ritual law" (Mr Vance Smith, p. 37), or the being "changed from heathenism to the faith of the Gospel;" (Taylor's Key to the Apost. Writings, Chap. x. and throughout: followed also by Mr Belsham, in his Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistles of Paul).

As a main principle of the system (for it spreads its cancerous fibres through the whole body of religion), it is maintained that "our present Christian privileges and state bear a correspondence to the state and privileges of the ancient Jews;—all of us, Christians without exception, do enjoy all the common honours, encouragements, advantages, and blessings of a peculiar people, as well as all the Israelites did." (Taylor.) A brief and fair epitome of the theory is given by Dr Guyse in his Preface to his Paraphrase on the Ep. to the Romans.

Jehovah, in establishing his peculiar covenant with the Israelites, commanded Moses to deliver this message to them: "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians; and I have borne you on eagles' wings, and brought you to myself. Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me, above all people (for all the earth is mine); and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." (Exod. xix. 3–6; and compare Deut. vii. 6–8.) In evident allusion to this passage, the apostle Peter writes to Christians: "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people; which, in time past, were not a people, but are now the people of God; which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy." (1 Ep. ii. 9.)

The question then is, HOW we are to understand these expressions and their cognates, in the two cases of their application; is their meaning *similar* in each; or is the former case a *symbol* of a *far higher* sense in the latter?

All the dispensations of the Infinite Supreme, so far as we know, or can from analogies conjecture them, present a harmony of design and action, and common character, PROGRESS. This is manifested to us in what we can perceive of created beings, in natural providence, in the history of human society, in the individual man, in his culture for eternity, and in the provision which God has made for that culture. The design of man's existence, so far as himself is concerned, is to attain the highest perfection of which he is, or shall progressively be, capable. That perfection lies in moral and natural good; holiness and happiness.

The plan of the Divine Government has been to promote and ultimately attain that end, by the influence of rational motives on the mind of man. The action produced by that influence, is Religion. To form, preserve, improve, and perfect religion, has been the constant object of God's wise beneficence, in the disclosures and the institutions of Revelation.

The chief ideas in those disclosures are the mental and moral constitution of man, by which he is *able* and *responsible* in the matter of obedience to God;—a *law* to regulate obedience;—*sin*, the violation of that law, and its dire consequences, whether by a natural and necessary connexion, or by a positive exercise of judicial equity;—any method of *precluding* those consequences, that is, of exempting the transgressor from the penalties, natural or inflicted, which he has incurred; and doing this in consistency with righteousness;—and, finally, such a condition of the *will and active faculties* of man as is in harmony with the proper design of his existence and the approbation of God, the Sovereign Judge.

The first human beings became sinners, and their posterity imitated and immensely augmented the acts and habits of transgression. Manifestations were made of the holy law and its sanctions, both to man's internal consciousness and to his outward perceptions. Manifestations were also made of a plan of mercy and grace, which, by abrogating the tremendous consequences of sin, and changing the mind and character of the sinner into a condition of holiness, would raise him to pure and permanent happiness.

For reasons of the highest wisdom, whether perceptible to us or not, God was pleased to make those manifestations *gradually;* carrying the human race through a kind of education. In the childhood of mankind, strong appeals were made to the senses, for impressing the great ideas of religion. Accordingly, a system of material objects and sensible performances was the best adapted, for the two purposes of communicating knowledge, and of preserving it. The rite of sacrificature comprised all the great ideas. In the absence, or small extent, of written documents, it was full of pathetic instruction. Of its universality we have abundant evidence.

It pleased the Being of infinite wisdom to select one small nation to be the depositary and conservatrix of his revelations, till an era should arrive for the most perfect display of the SALVATION provided for sinful man, and its unrestricted distribution. Through the suspensive period, under his direction, that nation was bound by a system of laws, partly moral, partly political, and partly emblematical. Of those branches, the first was adapted to *convict* of sin; the second was not only the best provision of civil polity that the world had ever seen, but it contained demonstrative evidences of the *divine origin and authority* of the revelation; and the third (be it especially observed), was a systematic arrangement of emblematical ceremonies, all connected with, and, as it were, revolving round, the *one impressive act*, a SACRIFICE as the appointed representation of deliverance from the greatest of evils and attaining the greatest good,—forgiveness and holiness.

But the very nature of this system involved *factitious representations;* let me call them *personifications.* It was impossible that the signs and the things signified should be identical. It was indeed a system of which the sacred writers were inspired by God to say that, in it, there was an unceasing remembrance kept up of sins,—that the guilt of despising it was inexpiable and fatal,—that by it the gospel was announced,—that, though it could never take away sins, it was a shadow of good things to come, and a lucid prediction that the way into the most holy place, a real access to the Divine favour, was, at the completion of the ages, to be opened by ONE who would effect the abolition of sin by the sacrifice of himself.

Reviewing, then, this divine plan carried on through ages and generations, we see its unity of design and the harmony of its parts leading to the result. The *design*, to show to man the GREAT SALVATION, deliverance from infinite evil and acquisition of infinite good; and the *parts*, conviction of sin, its pardon, and the reunion of man to God, as to his legal state by a real and sufficient expiation, and as to his consciousness by a change of character. The whole system bore the inscription, SIN AND SALVATION, *man's ruin and the grace of God.*

The learned and acute orientalist of whose labours I have made so frequent use, John David Michaelis, wrote a small volume, "a Sketch of Typical Theology (Entwurf der typischen Gottesgelartheit," Göttingen, 1763), in which he rescues this branch of moral science from misconception and abuse, and places it on a firm foundation of reason and historical evidence. In the preface, after some cautions against fanciful interpretations, and referring to the Hermeneutical Rules which he had given, he says,—"This objection being removed, I see no just ground for disregarding Typical Theology. Do any treat with disrespect the labours of those learned men who have given us illustrations of the Egyptian figures, or of the symbols found on the marbles and other monuments of the Greeks and Romans, if the evidence of truth be found in their labours? Why should the prefigurations of Moses be less fortunate? Should it be to their disadvantage, that they are a part of divine revelation? I justly add, that some of those types have a respect to the doctrine of the Messiah, such as is not only important for illustration, but absolutely indispensable. Of the SACRIFICES, this may be affirmed with the greatest right." (P. 8.)

All this appears to have been overlooked in framing the hypothesis of ritual-justification, which Mr Vance Smith maintains. Its advocates take the degenerate Judaism, the intruded pharisaism, of the last ages of the Levitical polity, as their first ground: and upon this assumption they build their system. Surely they ought to have looked farther back. They ought to have ascended through the prophets and the law, to the patriarchal and primeval ages. They ought to have investigated the whole compass of the covenant which Jehovah condescended to make with Abraham; and that other covenant, four hundred years after, made with a part of his posterity. Taking due cognizance of the great law of *progress*, they might thus have compared the successive ages of revelation, and have ascertained the relation which each part bore to the other.

Such a process, fairly conducted, would have led to the perception that the Israelitish history and institutions were a representation of something more advanced; a picture, composed of earthly and temporal materials, and addressed to the animal senses and the perishable interests of a civil community; but of which the design, wise and worthy of God, was to prefigure and introduce blessings for fallen mankind, of the most urgent necessity, of undecaying value; blessings for man, of all times and places, for the mind of man, for his highest faculties and susceptibilities, and for their immortal expansion; holiness, happiness, the whole comprehension of a moral communion with the Supreme Good.

It was a part of this constitution that "sometimes the historical narrations of the scriptures have been instituted, or at least are proposed to us, as instructive representations [*Vorbilder*, types]:" Michaelis; *typ. Gottesgel.* p. 34. No less a person than De Wette says, "The *entire Old Testament* is a *great prophecy*, a *great type* of him who was to come, and who has come. Who can deny that the holy seers of the Old Testament saw in spirit the advent of Christ long before he came; and in prophetic anticipations, sometimes more sometimes less clear, descried the new doctrine? And the typological comparison of the New with the Old Testament was by no means a play of fancy. Christianity lay in Judaism, as leaves and fruit do in the seed; although it certainly required the divine sun to bring them forth."[1]

Paul, and the other inspired teachers, while they refused subjection to those who sought to fix the yoke of the Mosaic law upon Gentile converts, rose to the comprehension of the whole case. They proclaimed a deliverance, not only from ceremonial disqualifications (the whole parade about which, when deprived of its signification, belonged to "beggarly elements"), but from *real sin*, in its dominion, defilement, and guilt: an effectual deliverance by the propitiatory sacrifice and the sanctifying power of the Lord Jesus Christ. Whoever desires to have a comprehensive and penetrating view of this class of subjects, without which Christian theology has no existence, will greatly benefit himself by the study of Dr Beecher's Sermon, "The gospel according to Paul;" from Gal. i. 8. Boston, U. S., 1829.

Here, I conceive, lies the chief point of difference between me and my animadverter. He maintains that, in the New Testament, particularly the writings of Paul, the terms *sin*, *righteousness*, *justification*, and others allied to them, refer solely to the rites and ceremonies of the Levitical law; and that the great question between Paul and his opponents was, Whether or not persons renouncing heathenism, and embracing Christianity, were bound to pass through the gate of Judaism? They were in a state of what Mr Vance Smith calls "ceremonial sin;" that is, not having been circumcised, nor conforming to the subsequent obligations of the Mosaic ritual, they were common, unrighteous, unclean, insusceptible of being admitted into the Messiah's kingdom; and they must undergo the process of proselytism, in order to such admission. If they complied with those conditions, which either one way or the other involved not *moral* rectitude, or its contrary, they were pardoned, justified, born again, sanctified, adopted, made members of the Christian Church, subjects of the kingdom of Christ. All these they might be, without any *moral* or *spiritual* change of either state before God, or consciousness of their own minds. Though they were, as the hypothesis runs, "made meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light, delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of the beloved Son of God, in whom they had redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins," they might be still destitute of moral goodness; they might be impious, vicious, and immoral, consequently, enemies to God, by their unholy dispositions and wicked works, condemned by his righteous law, and dying in that state, excluded from his favour. Perhaps, however, the last feature of description ought not to be inserted, as it may justly be apprehended that the persons alluded to entertain no formidable idea of such a catastrophe. Because I do not adopt this method of interpreting the apostolic writings, Mr Vance Smith regards me as offending the first principles of faithful interpretation.

---

[1] Cited from Bähr's *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*, by Mr Fairbairn, in his valuable Typology of Scripture, p. 37.

I rebut the charge. To me it appears that the proposers of this scheme, from the forerunners of Dr John Taylor—even including Mr Locke—down to the latest of his consentients, among whom Mr Vance Smith especially honours Bishop Herbert Marsh, and Professor Milman—grievously err, taking a part only of the case, and that the least important part, instead of the momentous whole. That the Judaical zealots entertained the opinion, and took the course described by those authors, is not contested; but it was a matter subordinate to the great problem of mankind, the question which had in all ages filled, and anxiously exercised, the most reflecting minds —"How shall man be held righteous with God?"[1] To this the records of Christianity give the decisive answer: "A man is not justified by works of law, but by faith in Jesus Christ;

[1] Job ix. 2. אֱנוֹשׁ poor, miserable man. The (*hiphil*) form of the verb must not be overlooked: "—neben Gott—gerecht bestehn;" stand out righteous at the sight of God: Eichhorn.

even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by works of law; for, by works of law no man can be justified."[1] For a patristic exposition, worthy of the name of "apostolic," will my reader turn to the fragment of an unknown author, prefixed to these Discourses?

The deliverance of the Israelites from the slavery and miseries of Egypt, the conduct towards them of God's miraculous providence, the national constitution and laws which he gave them, the sacrificial and other rites of their worship, which he commanded them to observe, were temporal blessings to them, and were also means of religious instruction and spiritual grace. The obvious significancy of those facts and institutions, and the combination with them of devout feelings and the exercises of faith, repentance, and acts of piety, rendered proper, as descriptive of the people thus favoured above all others, the descriptions of chosen, redeemed, ransomed, called, holy. Such appellations were both appropriate to the national privileges conferred, and adapted to awaken and strengthen devout affections, suitable to the time and the persons then existing, as is abundantly evinced in the devotional parts of the Old Testament; but they were also intended to be anticipative descriptions of character and state, obligations and enjoyments, under the final dispensation of grace to mankind. Hence, the subjects of the Messiah's kingdom are described in the New Testament by applying the language of the Israelitish constitution; such as, the Israel of God, the being Jews inwardly, whose praise is not of men, but of God (alluding to the derivation of the name *Judah*, *Jehudi*, etc. from the word which signifies *praise*), the Jerusalem which is above, heavenly, new, the mount Zion, the true circumcision, and the designations of privilege and character, which have been a little before mentioned. Now, to understand those designations under the pure and spiritual reign of the Messiah, as the latitudinarians do, as still denoting merely outward advantages, is contrary to the *progressive* character of the divine plan. But it is agreeable to the character of that plan, to regard the designations in question as applied to the Israelitish nation, *typically*, in order to their own spiritual instruction, for the time being, and to prepare the way for an application, in the most full and proper manner, under the gospel-dispensation.

---

[1] Gal. ii. 16, cited from the "Improved Version," edited by Mr Belsham, omitting only the six times of the article *the*, which are not in the original.

"I desire it may be recollected," says Dr Doddridge, "that when Christianity first appeared in the world, it was attended with such discouragements as made the very profession of it, in a great measure, a test of men's characters. The apostles therefore, knowing the number of hypocrites to be comparatively very small, generally take no notice of them, but address themselves to whole bodies of Christians, as if they were [all] truly what they professed to be. Just as our Lord Jesus Christ, though he knew the wickedness of Judas, often addressed himself to the whole body of his apostles, as if they were all his faithful servants; and makes gracious declarations and promises to the whole society, which could, by no means, be applicable to this one corrupt and wretched member of it. To determine the sense of the words called, redeemed, sanctified, etc. when applied to the Christian Church, by that in which they are used in Moses and the prophets with respect to the whole people of Israel, seems to me as unreasonable as it would be to maintain that the dimensions, the strength, and the beauty of a body, are to be most exactly estimated by looking at its shadow." (Discourses on Regeneration; Postscript to the Preface.)

The sentiments which appear to me to be the truth, in relation to this important subject, I would condense into a few short propositions.

i. The blessings to which the Israelites were chosen, and called, and for which they were redeemed, delivered, sanctified (that is, set apart), adopted, saved,—were the possession of the land of Canaan, according to the covenanted promises made to Abraham; with unfailing fertility, though in a region peculiarly liable to droughts, security from enemies without the use of the ordinary precautions, and an extraordinary accumulation of natural and civil enjoyments;—all implying a dispensation of constant miracles.

ii. This dispensation faded and vanished away, with its miraculous peculiarities. Its purposes were accomplished, when it gave way to Christianity. But Christianity brings with it no such enjoyments: nothing miraculously distinctive into the political and natural condition of a country, but only the blessings which flow naturally from its moral influence; such as the abolition of idolatry with its impure and cruel accompaniments, the elevation of the female sex, an improved tone of public manners; every thing, in short, that comes under the head of the temporal benefits of Christianity. To these let us add the advantages of a general profession of Christianity, and a formal attention to some of its ordinances. These latter, if not improved to purposes of practical piety, are hypocritical in their performance, and illusory in their effects. The two classes, separately or together, could not be regarded, without absurdity, as making persons *justified, sanctified,* etc.

iii. The interpreters (rather I must say, misinterpreters) of scripture referred to, seem to overlook a very obvious fact; that, in the constantly recurring descriptions of the apostolic epistles, the class of persons called by the terms under consideration, are also marked by other elements and qualities which cannot be turned away from the signification of *internal* and *conscious* piety and virtue, and all the proper *external* results in *moral and religious obedience.* In connexions inseparable from the disputed phraseology, they are shown to be those who have received the gospel, not as the word of men, but as the word of God, which effectually worketh in them that believe; whose obedience had come abroad unto all men [evidently by its peculiar excellence];—distinguished by the work of faith, the labour of love, and the patience of hope;—examples to other believers, in faith, patience, and charity, so that the inspired teachers gave thanks with joy, on those accounts, on every remembrance of them;—who had purified their souls in obeying the truth, through the Spirit;—who were not only saints (for that glorious word ἅγιοι, is disputed, and degraded into a mere professional term), but *faithful* (πιστοί, trustworthy, in whose religious sincerity full confidence could be placed);—and accurately distinguished from false professors of religion, who had a form of godliness, but denied the power thereof.

Our opponents refer to the constant strain of exhortation, command, and warning, in which the apostles address those whom they acknowledge to be "washed, sanctified, justified;" as if it were inconsistent with what we have been asserting. Alas! I fear they know little, beyond dry theory, of scriptural sanctification: or they would be aware that the Spirit of God "draws with cords of a man, with bands of love," working by rational motives and persuasives, to the production and the preservation of vital religion: that therefore the whole array of practical injunction, promise, and threatening, is a principal part of the means of salvation employed by Him who worketh in his faithful people "both to will and to do, of his good pleasure."

iv. Upon the hypothesis, those "antecedent blessings" do not appear to be of a value so transcendent as to comport with the glowing language, the heavenly rapture, in which they are introduced and dwelt upon in the Epistles of Paul, Peter, and John. They are subordinate means to spiritual and holy ends, excellent and highly valuable indeed, but not of the first order: for we may become sincerely and perseveringly virtuous without them, and consequently eternally happy; yes, in that case, our virtue would be more meritorious, because acquired with less foreign aid, and more self-created energy.

v. In Rom. viii. 30, we find the series of these blessings evidently designed to connect eternity with eternity: "Whom he foreknew them he foreordained, and whom he foreordained them he also called, and whom he called them he also justified, and whom he justified them he also glorified." Upon the scheme of interpretation which we are compelled to oppose, "glorification," the possession of heavenly perfection, must be one of the "antecedent blessings."

vi. It ought to be shown precisely *who* those persons are, to whom these antecedent blessings belong. Do they attach to all mankind? The hypothesis cannot admit this; for it implies a knowledge of the blessings as a part of revealed truth: or, is it to those only who are born of Christian parents, or who have been baptized (persons who have nothing of the Christian about them but their geographical birth), however ignorant, careless, and irreligious? Or, is some measure of knowledge and earnest profession necessary? If so, *what* measure?

vii. The whole body of real Christians is neither less nor more than the sum of the units, each of which is a real Christian, that is, a sincerely holy person. The New Testament knows nothing of unconverted converts, unholy saints, unbelieving believers. "He only has a title to the honourable name of a Christian, who departs from iniquity. If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. Christ is the door of the sheep; and therefore none are God's sheep who enter not in at this door. He that believeth not, whatever he may profess, has no part in Christ's salvation, but is condemned already. Nothing external is of any avail, under the gospel, unless accompanied with the new creature, and faith which worketh by love. Old things are done away, and all things are become new. The Messias is of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord, and does not judge after the sight of his eyes, nor reprove after the hearing of his ears. It is the heart, not the outward appearance, which he regards. The most splendid performances, if without charity, he accounts as nothing. The Lord only knoweth them that are his. Consequently, that which constitutes one a member of the Christian Church [really and properly such], is invisible to the human eye. Believing with the heart, as well as confessing with the mouth, is a necessary condition of the gospel-salvation. Those who are only outwardly and in profession religious, are of the synagogue of Satan,—spots in our feasts,—children of the devil,—tares sown by the wicked one,—false brethren, brought in, or crept in, unawares,—having no lot nor portion in the blessings of Christ's purchase, because yet in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity.—Hence, Paul pronounces a general sentence of excommunication against false-hearted professors: 'If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be *anathema maranatha*.' And, indeed, who can be more detestable and worthy of a more dreadful curse, than he who harbours in his heart enmity against Christ, under the mask of pretended friendship?"[1]

The principal remaining topic, on which my strongest convictions are that Mr Vance Smith is deeply in error, is that of *Justification*, and the *Law* according to which it can, or cannot, take place.

In his view, the state of *Sin*, which is opposed to the Justification, was not moral obliquity, but a want of conformity to the *ritual* or *ceremonial* Law; and the *Justification* was a being "put into possession of God's peculiar favour—identical with the being qualified for becoming subjects of Messiah, as soon as that expected personage should appear. This Messianic kingdom, it was believed, would be exclusively possessed by Jews: Messiah was to be the prince and deliverer of Israel alone; he was to expel the idolatrous Gentiles from the holy city; and to reduce them, in their turn, beneath the sway of the chosen people; and in all this anticipated glory and triumph, no Gentile, it was thought, could have any part—those only excepted who had previously conformed to the Mosaic law, or had, in fact, previously become Jews.—

---

[1] Dr Erskine's Theological Dissertations; p. 73. Lond. 1765. An inestimable work, on the Sinai Covenant, on Dr John Taylor's Key, and other interesting subjects. It is greatly to be desired that it were reprinted.

"When we find the apostle Paul strenuously arguing that justification (δικαιοσύνη, Rom. iii. 21, 22, 25) is not attainable by 'works of the law,' does he not mean the *same* thing which his countrymen, in his own time, meant by that word? He is manifestly opposing *their* prejudices; but if he does not mean by justification what *they* meant, what application can his arguments have to them? So we might ask in reference to the 'works of the law,' of which the apostle speaks in his epistles to the Galatians and Romans."—Pp. 22, 23.

Be it, then, especially noted, that the SUBJECT of controversy between Paul and his Jewish opponents, the thing meant by the term Justification, was *the same* in the conception of each of the parties; and then, *what* was it, as to its nature, comprehension, and effects? Mr Vance Smith tells us it was a being "put into the peculiar favour of God;" and this, he resolves into an emancipation of the Jews from vassalage, the expulsion of the Gentile oppressors from Jerusalem, and their reduction beneath the sway of the Jews. Now, is this anything else than a great political revolution; such an event as earth's mad heroes have sought, and often accomplished, wading through oceans of blood? Certainly this was an object congenial to the character which Mr Vance Smith, from Milman, has justly imputed to the Jewish rulers—men who coolly violated every principle of humanity and religion, while to the minutest degree observant of silly superstitions—men whose idea of the Messianic kingdom, was the gratifying of their ambition, voluptuousness, and avarice, their revenge and thirst for blood. But was this Paul's idea of the subject? Was this the "state of privilege" which he approved, which he desired, which he taught universally? Was this the enjoyment for which he exulted in suffering the loss of all things, that (says he) "I might gain Christ, and might be found in him, not having mine own justification which is from the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the justification which is from God because of faith?"—(Phil. iii. 9, Impr. Vers.) I cannot but think that Mr Vance Smith would disclaim such a being "identical," and would say that the identity which he means lay only in the general idea of being "rendered righteous in the sight of God, and put into possession of his peculiar favour;" and that the specific mode of realizing that idea, was essentially different in the mind of Paul from the conception of the false teachers. Mr Vance Smith would abhor the impiety of the latter, but would give his approbation to the pure and rational quality of the former.

Then, we find here a broad difference between the Justification which Paul meant, and that "which his countrymen, in his own time, meant by that word." Was he, then, ignorant of the question? or did he seek to evade it? By no means. The semblance of fallacy lies in my opponent's partial apprehension of the case. The question was, *how* to be "put into possession of the peculiar favour of God:" but to the further question, *wherein* that favour consisted, the reply of Paul and that of the Judaizers would have been as contrary to each other as light and darkness, as heaven and hell.

Thus we arrive at a position of great importance. The object to be obtained, "the favour of God," was, in the eye of the Judaizers, identical with the gratification of their guilty passions, a consummation of wickedness: in the eye of Paul, it was "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit,—the having iniquity pardoned, sin covered,—peace with God,—being reconciled to God by the death of his Son,—freed from sin and condemnation,—saved from wrath,—accepted in the Beloved, in him having redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins,—the living not to ourselves, but to him that died and was raised again for us."

The spirit of these expressions penetrates all the apostolic writings. Yet Mr Vance Smith and his authorities regard them as declaring only an exoneration from "ceremonial sin," which had "no necessary relation to real *moral* unrighteousness" (p. 23); and that the *law*, of which they were the violation, was only the injunction of certain acts and observances which, in themselves and apart from the positive authority commanding them, for a purpose of *signification*, were of no religious value, but were "a figure [*παραβολή·* parable, emblem, type, representative sign], down to the present time;—only (in addition to articles of food and drinking and various washings) ordinances of the flesh [merely external], laid upon [the Israelitish nation] unto a time of setting things right [*διορθώσις·* an improved constitution]." Heb. ix. 9, 10.

Mr Vance Smith makes it a subject of reprehension against me, that I could "take texts out of those very passages in which Paul is arguing the subject of the Gentile controversy, and assign a meaning to those texts, and found upon that meaning the most important doctrines, all the time without giving the remotest hint that that controversy has any thing to do with the business of interpretation." (P. 26.)

I reply by denying the assumption. I can find no sufficient proofs that the Gentile-controversy was that which Grotius, Hammond, Locke, Whitby, Taylor, Watson, Marsh, Milman, Belsham, and Mr Vance Smith assert it to have been; of such kind and manner that the refutation of the apostle referred only to the ceremonial law. Indeed Mr Locke himself plainly regards the error of the Judaizing teachers as being the expectation of securing the favour of God, the "justification," by obedience to the Mosaic law taken at large, but most especially respecting the *moral* part of it. (On Gal. ii. and Rom. iii. v. vii. etc.)

If we admit that, in a few[1] passages, the apostle employs the term "the law" to denote the political and ceremonial institutes of the Hebrews, it is not the less evident that such cases are rare exceptions, and that the term is usually taken in the sense comprehensive of the whole divine preceptive will. In some passages also the Jewish fond opinion of the meritorious efficacy of a descent from Abraham and Jacob, and of its national sign, is both indirectly and expressly confuted. But it is very evident that, in those places, ceremonial works are renounced from being a ground of justification, as species under a genus which is altogether thus rejected.

As further evidence that, where the term *Law* stands in connexion with the subject of Justification, it includes all Moral Obedience, and that as its principal article, I adduce the following considerations.

1. The Law which has this connexion is continually represented as that, to which obedience is an act or habit belonging to the state of the soul before God.

Speaking of this law, the apostle adds,—"for he is not a Jew [in the true meaning of the word, *deserving praise*], who is one outwardly; nor is that circumcision which is outward, in the flesh: but he is a Jew who is one inwardly, and circumcision, that of the heart, in spirit, not in letter; whose praise [still alluding to the name] is not of men, but of God." Rom. ii. 28, 29. "That the righteous doing [δικαίωμα] may be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh, but according to the spirit." viii. 4. "He who loveth the other [τ. ἕ. his fellow-man, neighbour] hath fulfilled the law: for the [— induction of precepts,—all] are summed up in this expression, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. This love is the fulfilling of the law." xiii. 8–10. The same verbally, Gal. v. 14.

---

[1] Koppe thinks, *in none at all.* "Leges rituales,—quantum video, nunquam solæ, exclusis cæteris moralibus, νόμος dicuntur." The ritual laws, so far as I can perceive, taken alone and excluding the moral, are never called *the law.* (On Rom. vi. 14.)

2. It is assumed as being identical with the Ten Commandments. 2 Cor. iii. 7.

3. The violations opposed to it are moral offences.

The passages are too long to be transcribed, but I trust the reader will turn to them. Rom. ii. 17–27; iii. 9–19; vii. 7, 12, 14, 16; and numerous other passages.

4. It is that which, by its discoveries, as a manifestation of the Divine holiness and of human duty, furnishes us with a knowledge of the nature and evil of sin.

"Whatsoever things the law saith, it speaketh to those who are under [ἐν, within its jurisdiction] the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God," [as the Judge: ὑπόδικος occurs only here in the New Testament, and never in the LXX.—answering to the Roman *reus*, or our phrase *being cast*:—"Deo satisfactionem debens pro eo quod peccavit;" owing to God a satisfaction for offence committed: *Bretschneider, in Lex.*] "Wherefore, by works of law no flesh shall be justified before him; for through the law is the acknowledgment of sin." Rom. iii. 19, 20. "I had not known sin, except through the law." vii. 7.

5. The most awful denunciation of judicial penalty is proclaimed against transgression of this law.

"Whosoever are [q. d. subjects, expectants, votaries] of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one who continueth not in all [the precepts] that are written in the book of the law, to perform them." Gal. iii. 10. Now let us look to the portion of the Mosaic writings here referred to (Deut. xxvii. 15–26); and we find that all the breaches of law mentioned are moral offences, and that they refer, as to genera, to all the precepts of the Decalogue, except the fourth, which in *form* is ceremonial, and was abrogated by Christianity, but of which the *moral essence* is reducible to verses 15 and 26.

6. It is itself the instrument, or edict, which declares the righteous displeasure of God against sin, in every kind and degree: for each command of the Ten may be justly regarded as a species, given as an instance to represent all species falling

under one genus or class. This comprehensive view of the Decalogue belongs to the *Theology* of the case, and is perfectly consistent with the *political* exposition, according to which the Decalogue is construed strictly, that is, according to the bare letter: and then it required nothing but a servile literality of obedience, and was the condition of the earthly charter of Canaan for Israel. See Dr John Erskine's luminous Essay on the Sinai Covenant.

"The law worketh wrath" [Verdammniss], condemnation, perdition; De Wette. "Leges delictis pœnas annunciant;" Koppe.

7. It is that rule, enjoining what is right and prohibiting what is wrong, of which the substance is, to an extent sufficient for accountableness, impressed upon the minds of men destitute of external revelation, by the natural workings of conscience and reflection.

"When the Gentiles, who have not law by nature, perform the things [enjoined] of the law, these persons, not having law, are to themselves law; who manifest the law's operation written in their own hearts, their conscience witnessing with it, and their reasonings between each other, accusing or apologizing for them." Rom ii. 14, 15.

8. The observance of it is declared to be infinitely more important than circumcision; and, by parity of reason, than any other ceremonial institution. Ib. v. 26, 27.

9. The apostle lays it down as an unavoidable inference from his doctrine, that "it excludes boasting." But this would not be true if the acts disclaimed were only those required by the ceremonial law. As it would then remain that the formal reason, the ground of right, in the being accepted into the favour of God, is our own moral excellence; so that, in whatever degree it existed, would furnish a much more obvious and natural ground of *self-valuation* than any that can be imagined to lie in ritual performances. Nothing can exceed the strength and explicitness of the divine declarations on this head. "—The law speaketh,—in order that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become condemned before the judgment of God [ὑπόδικος—τῷ Θεῷ].—Where, then, is boasting [or glorying]? It is excluded. That no flesh [*i. e.* none of mankind] may glory in his presence.—This [the being saved], not of yourselves: the gift of God: not from works; that no one may glory." Rom. iii. 19, 27; 1 Cor. i. 29; Eph. ii. 8.

10. Justification is, in the strongest terms, denied to be, not only of or from "works of the law," or of "law" taken indefinitely; but, in the most comprehensive and absolute terms, "of works,—of our own righteousness,—of works of righteousness which we have done." Rom. iv. 5; x. 3; xi. 6; Gal. ii. 16; Tit. iii. 5.

11. The law, from which the writings of Paul so strongly repudiate the justification of a sinner, is especially defined to be that which is *not abrogated* by the dispensation or system of the gospel: but the ceremonial law is most abundantly and expressly declared to have been so abrogated. Rom. iii. 31; Gal. iii. iv. v.; Heb. vii.–x.

12. The doctrine of a renunciation of this law, so far as respects the obtaining of justification before God, is admitted by the apostle to be liable to a *primâ facie* objection, as furnishing to opponents, or to superficial thinkers, an apparent allowance for sinful conduct. "What shall we then say? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? Far be it!" Rom vi. 1. Now such an objection could attach only to the doctrine which Mr Vance Smith and those who think with him are opposing. There would be no plausibility in arguing;—because I am not under the obligation to perform the Levitical ceremonies, I am at liberty to violate the dictates of piety or the rules of virtue and morality.

For many of the sentiments here advanced, I am indebted to a book of singular merit, *The Scripture Doctrine of Sanctification; by the Rev. James Fraser; Edinb.* 1774.

These are reasons for which I think that Mr Vance Smith's notion of the apostle's argument is utterly inapplicable; and that a fair view of the state of the case between Paul and his Judaical opponents would coincide with that which is supported in this volume, and would be the opposite of Mr Vance Smith's opinion, however fortified by the suffrages of Marsh, Milman, or others.

He objects to my conclusions, that they are drawn from a fragmentary selection of passages from almost all parts of the Scriptures;—that the great doctrine which I devote my life to maintain, is no where in the Bible to be found "existing as a *whole*," but is formed by pieces and patches, arbitrarily assumed; and that, "to frame and put them together into one self-consistent and compact structure, requires not merely the labour and learning of the Four Discourses, but also many an interposed argumentation and conjecture, and explanation of profane Reason!"—P. 68.

I give a short reply.

My selection and arrangement of passages I maintain to be no other than a compendious, but fair and just, summary of the intent and meaning of the entire Revelation of God for the recovery of mankind to holiness and happiness. Upon the criticism and interpretation of the single passages, I deny the justness of his, and maintain the soundness of my own representations; and I make my appeal to those who use their learning with that holy impartiality which is never dissevered from piety. I affirm that many of those passages, and others, *do present*, severally, the doctrine "as a whole;" for example, Isaiah liii.; Rom. iii. 21–28; v. 5–11; vi.; viii.; 1 Cor. i.; 2 Cor. iv. v. vi.; Gal. ii. 16–21; Eph. i. ii. iii.; Phil. iii. 1–10; Tit. ii. 11–14; iii. 3–8. To his reprehension that I have resorted to the use of "profane Reason," I answer that, herein, I have but followed the example of many of the most scriptural and pious writers on religious subjects (—*e.g.* Augustine, Baxter, Howe, the two Edwardses, Wollaston, Butler, Woods, Whewell,—and how many more?—) who have deemed it no derogation from the paramount authority of God's word, to show that its capital doctrines, though not discoverable by the genius or any other powers of man, are, when made known to us, capable of being proved to be in analogical accordance with ascertained facts in the system of creation and providence, and with the intellectual and moral nature of man.

My opponent and I are at issue upon the *essential constitution* of the Gospel. I cannot hold the balance as if in equilibrium, and with compliments say, he may be right and I may be wrong. *My convictions of the* TRUTH *are stronger than I have any words to express.* He is a young man: I am old: and soon will both of us "appear before the judgment-seat of Christ. The Lord grant that he and I may find mercy of the Lord in that day!"

"HE THAT BELIEVETH ON THE SON OF GOD HATH THE WITNESS IN HIMSELF."

"UNTO HIM WHO LOVED US,—AND GAVE HIMSELF FOR US THAT HE MIGHT REDEEM US FROM ALL INIQUITY,—AND WASHED US FROM OUR SINS IN HIS OWN BLOOD,—UNTO HIM BE GLORY AND DOMINION FOR EVER AND EVER! AMEN."

INDICES.

I.

WORDS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, ON WHICH SOME REMARK OR ILLUSTRATION IS OFFERED.

Page
אֵין לוֹ . . . 35
אֶרֶץ גְזֵרָה . . . 228
אָשָׁם . 224, 230, 232
הִשְׂכִּיל . . . 38
זֶבַח . . . 221
זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים . . . 233
חָטָא . . 224, 233
חַטָּאת . . 230, 232
חָרַץ . . . 35
כֹּהֵן . . . 80
כָּלָה . . . 35
כָּרָה . . . 31
כִּפֶּר and its derivatives, 121, 233, 293, 294
לָמוֹ . . . 244

Page
מוֹכִיחַ . . . 98
מִנְחָה . . . 221
מִזְרָק . . . 222
נְדָבָה . . . 234
נָזָה . . . 38
עֲזָאזֵל . . . 228
עֵד . . . 229
עֹלָה . . . 223
פִּנָּה . . . 136
צֶמַח . . . 236
קָרָב . . . 222
שִׂיחַ . . . 38
שֶׁלֶם תּוֹדָה . . . 234
תְּנוּפָה }
תְּרוּמָה } . . . 222

II.

WORDS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, ON WHICH SOME REMARK OR ILLUSTRATION IS OFFERED.

Αγιάζειν . . . 94, 123
ἄγκυρα 134
ἀγοράζειν . . . 184
ἁμαρτία 166
ἀπόστολος . . . 91
ἀρχηγός 111
ἀρχιερεύς 83
Διαθήκη 104
Εγγυος 96
ἐντυγχάνειν, etc. . . 114
ἐφάπαξ 123
Θυσιαστήριον . . . 132
Ἱερεύς 79
ἱλαστήριον . . . 40
Καθαρισμός . . . 121
κεφάλαιον . . . 88
Λατρεία 92
λειτουργός . . . 92
λύειν, λύτρον, and their compounds, 181, 190, 194
Μεσίτης . 96, 102, 110
Ὁλόκαυστον and synonyms . . . 223
ὁμολογία 83
Παράκλητος . . . 114
περιποιεῖσθαι . . . 46
πρόσφατος . . . 139
Σφάζειν 184
Σώζειν and σωτήρ . 113, 265
Τελειωθείς . . 87, 112
τιμή 184
Ὑπέρ 184
ὑπόστασις . . . 63
Χρηματίζειν . . . 93

III.

PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE, OF WHICH SOME ELUCIDATION IS ATTEMPTED.

Page
Gen. iv. 3–7. . (Abel's and Cain's sacrifice) 207
Lev. vi. xvii. . and many other passages in the ceremonial directions of the Pentateuch 32, 221, etc. 294
Job ix. 33. . . Daysman betwixt us 98
Ps. xl. 6–8. . Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire 31
xlv. 7. . . O God, thy God hath anointed thee . . 126
cx. 4. . . Priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec 33
cxviii. 22. . Stone which the builders rejected . . 136
cxix. 118. . All, that err from thy statutes . . . 148
Prov. xi. 8. . Righteous delivered, wicked in his stead . 293
xiv. 6. . Scorner seeketh wisdom, and findeth not . 243
xxi. 18. . Wicked, a ransom for the righteous . . 293
Is. viii. 14. . Sanctuary, and stone of stumbling . . 137
xliii. 3, 4. . Egypt for thy ransom—men for thee . . 186
lii. 13 to liii. 12. } Sufferings and death of the Messiah 36, 237, 240, 251–257
Jer. xxx. 21, 22. Their Prince shall be from themselves, etc. 99
Dan. ix. 24–27. Seventy weeks, determined with regard, etc. 34
Zech. vi. 13. . He shall sit and rule,—a Priest . . . 33, 234
ix. 11. . The blood of thy covenant 117
Mal. iii. 3. . . He shall purify the sons of Levi . . . 92
Matt. xxvi. 28. Blood of the new covenant shed for many . 46
Luke xxii. 37. The things concerning me have an end . 239
John i. 29. . . The sin of the world 278
iii. 16. . . The world 278
Acts iii. 15. . Author of life 111
31. . Prince and Saviour 111
xx. 28. . Church, acquired by his own blood . . 46
Rom. i. 19–22. That which may be known of God . . 159
ii. 14. . Gentiles, a law to themselves . . . 159
iii. 25. . Whom God hath set forth, a propitiatory sacrifice 40
iv. 24. . Delivered up on account of our sins . . 117
v. 6–11. Christ,—dying for the ungodly . . . 192
v. 18. . Upon all men 278
xiv. 15. . For whom Christ died 279
2 Cor. v. 14. . One died for all, then did the all die . . 47
Gal. iii. 20. . A Mediator is not of one 100
Phil. ii. 17. . If I be poured out as a libation . . . 261
Col. i. 24. . . Rejoice in my sufferings for you . . . 261
ii. 13–15. . Blotting out the hand-writing . . . 190
1 Tim. iii. 16. Great, the mystery of godliness . . . 67, 271
ii. 4. . All men to be saved 278
2 Tim. iv. 1. . Before God and the Lord Jesus Christ . 279

Page
Heb. i. 3. . . Express Image of his manner of existence . 63
ii. 10. . . Author of salvation 111
11. . . He who sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified 94
14. . . Who hath the power of death . . . 189
17. . . Merciful and faithful High-Priest . . 83
iii. 1. . . High-Priest of our confession . . . 83
Messenger 91
iv. 14. . . Great High-Priest, passed into the heavens 83, 118
15. . . Sympathize with our weaknesses . . 84, 139
v. 1. . . High-Priest, on the behalf of men . . 82
5. . . Assumed not this honour to himself . . 85, 119
6. . . Order of Melchisedec 87
7–10. . (Christ's sufferings and learning obedience) 85
vi. 6. . . Crucify the Son of God afresh . . . 120
19. . . Refuge,—hope,—anchor . . . 134, 135
20. . . Forerunner for us entered 115
vii. 22. . . Surety of a better covenant 96
24. . . Continuing ever, unchangeable priesthood . 122
26. . . Such a High-Priest became us . . . 88
27. . . This he did, offering up himself . . . 266
28. . . The Son, made perfect for ever 122
viii. 2. . . Minister of the sanctuary 92
4. . . If on earth, he would not be a priest . . 82
6. . . Mediator of a better covenant . . . 96
ix. 11. . . High-Priest of future blessings . . . 90
12. . . Expiation of transgressions under the first covenant 183
14. . . Through the Eternal Spirit 66, 270
ix. 15–23. (Validity of the new covenant by a sacrifice) 111, 112
23, 24. Heavenly things purified by sacrifices . 141
25–28. Put away sin by the sacrifice of himself . 123
x. 10. . . Offering—of Jesus Christ, once . . . 123
19–22. Admitted into the holiest, by the blood of Jesus 139
21. . . A great Priest over the house of God . . 82
29. . . Trampled upon the Son of God . . . 120
xi. 4. . . By faith, Abel offered 207
Author and Perfecter of faith . . . 111
xii. 2. . . The joy set before him 126
24. . . Mediator of the new covenant . . . 110
25. . . Who now delivereth the divine oracles . 93
xiii. 10. . . We have an altar 132
11. . . Jesus,—suffered without the gate . . 133
20, 21. The blood of the everlasting covenant . 116
1 John ii. 1. . Advocate with the Father 114
2. For the sins of the whole world . . . 278
Jude 4. . . . Denying our Lord Jesus Christ . . . 279

IV.

PRINCIPAL SUBJECTS AND ALLUSIONS.

ABEL; his sacrifice, 21, 206, 210. Cry of his blood, 111.
Abrabenel, Rabbi, on the design of sacrifice, 26.
Access to God, an effect of the sacrifice of Christ, 133, 139.
Accommodation System, in Biblical Interpretation, 20, 148, 204, 241.
Alscheth, Rabbi, applies Isaiah liii. to the Messiah, 36.
Anchor, its emblematical meaning, 134.
Anger of God, 55, 130.
Antinomian notions upon the Moral Law, 165.
Aristotle, his description of a priest, 82. On the idea of ransoming, 182.
Arminian hypothesis, with respect to the Moral Law, 164.
Atonement, doctrine of, 126, 158. Latent causes of disaffection to it, 77. Propriety of describing it by the analogy of pecuniary obligations, 118, 184. A symbolical atonement, the design of the Levitical sacrifices, 223, 229. Atonement, with the idea of ransom, 186, 293. Great annual day of atonement, 226, 229. Extent of, 72, 273. Recent authors upon, 301.
Azazel, on the meaning of the term, 228.

BELSHAM, Rev. Thomas; in the Unitar. Impr. Vers. on the argument of the Ep. to the Heb., 204.
Bosworth, Rev. Jos., D.D.; his Anglo-Saxon etymology of *sin*, 167.
Brown, Dr John; his writings recommended, 280.

CALVIN, on Heb. ii. 11; 96. On the design and extent of the atonement, 278.
Causation, the philosophy of, favourable to the doctrines of redemption, 258.
Ceremonies, their design and use, 18.
Changeableness in the Deity, not implied in the doctrine of the atonement, 129.
CHRIST, OUR LORD JESUS; his qualifications for the work of expiation, 58, 61, 63, 66. His suretyship and mediation, 96. His unutterable sufferings, 49 (see *Sufferings*); the antecedent and cause of salvation, 74, 112, 260. His assumption of the human nature, 94. His learning obedience by suffering, 86. His exaltation and reward, 88, 90, 125. His presiding over the universal worship of the church, 92. His intercession, 62, 123. Relation of his Divine Nature to the value of his atonement, 62–64, 66–69. Hints upon his Deity, 63, 66, 93, 95, 120, 124, 270, 272. See Priesthood and Sacrifice.
Chrysostom, on Christ as the author of life, 112.
Cocceius on the term Priest, 80.
Confession of sins, the accompaniment of a sacrifice, 27, 224, 226.
Cooper, Rev. B. H.; his Version of the Ep. to the Romans, 308.

Corner-stone, its symbolical meaning, 135.
Cramer, Prof. on the construction of 1 Tim. iii. 16; 272.

Dahler, John Geo., of Strasburg; on Jer. xxx. 21, 22; 99.
Dana, Dr, of Boston; on the term *guilt*, 260.
Davidson, Dr Samuel; on Gal. iii. 20; 102.
Decalogue, the true idea of, 159.
Delany, Dr Patrick; on sacrifice, 205, 211.
De Wette; on Jer. xxx. 21; 99. On trespass and sin-offerings, 229. His awful perversion of Christian doctrine, 239. His remarkable concession with respect to the O. T., 313.
Displeasure of God against sin, necessary to be manifested, 54.
Divine attributes manifested, 42.
Druidical notions of sacrifice, 201, 216, 233.

Edwards, Presid.; on the importance of maintaining the moral laws of the universe, 263.
Egyptian notions of sacrifice, 233.
Election, doctrine of, 73, 275.
Ernesti, J. A., on Heb. ix. 12; 183.
Erskine, Dr, on the Sinai Covenant, 97, 319.
Ewing, Rev. Greville, on Heb. ix. 16; 106.
Expediency, not the true foundation of a moral system, 164.
Expiation, nature of, 126, 130.

Fairbairn, Rev. J., on the types of the O. T., 313.
Falconer, the late William, M.D., on the words of the centurion at the cross, 265.
Fall of man, 23.
Forster, Rev. C., on the Ep. to the Hebrews, 145, 285.
Foundation of Moral Obligation, 162.
Fraser, his work on Sanctification, and the Ep. to the Romans, 325.

Gelpe, Rev. F. C., on the Ep. to the Hebrews, 288.
German Metaphysics, 163.
Gesenius, Prof. (d. Oct. 23, 1842, æt. 66); on the term Priest, 81. His arguments against applying the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah to the Messiah, 241. His version of that portion of scripture, 253. His collusive mode of admitting prophecies of the Messiah, 248.
Gospel, invitations of, founded upon the atoning sacrifice of Christ, 71, 76.
Government, supreme moral, 43; its nature and necessity, 129, 158.
Grace of God, 45. Not excited by the atonement of Christ, 130.
Grimm, Jakob Ludwig Karl (James Lewis Charles), Prof. Göttingen, the illustrious philologist, on the primary meaning of the word *sin*, 167.
Grotius, on heathen notions of sacrifice, 217. His interpretation of Heb. vii. 27; 267.
Guilt: its ambiguous meaning, and in what sense imputed to Christ, 260.

Hallett, Jos., on Heb. xi. 4; 209.

Happiness, its nature and originating principle, 167.
Heaven secured from dishonour by the sacrifice of Christ, 140.
Hebrews, the Epistle to the; its divine authority, 285.
Heinrichs's testimony to the Deity of Christ, 120.
Hitzig's, Ferd., version of Is. liii.; 251.
Holiness, defined, 165. The holiness of God, 42.
Hooker's eulogy of law, 165.
Hume, on causation, 258.
Hyrcanus, John, 98.

INFLUENCE of the Holy Spirit, 74.
——— moral, of the doctrines of grace and redemption, 77.

JENKYN, Dr T. W., on the Atonement, recommended, 279.
Jenyns, Soame, on the luminous evidence of the Scriptures to the doctrine of the Atonement, 48.
Jerome on Abel's sacrifice, 209.
Josephus on the annual day of expiation, 227. On trespass-offerings, 231.
Justice, the sole demand of the moral law, 161, 170; Retributive, 173; Remunerative, 174; Punitive, 174. The justice of GOD, 42, 54.

KIMCHI, David; on the term Priest, 80.
Kitto's Pictorial History of Palestine, recommended, 220. In which recommendation, I wish to include his Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature.
Knapp, on the advocacy of Christ and the Holy Spirit, recommended, 115.
Koppe, John Benj., on Isaiah, 245. His Scholia on the Ep. Rom. 322, 324.

LAW, its general nature, 128, 159, 165. Moral, 43, 159, 162. That of God, not founded on mere will, 161; but on the basis of supreme and unalterable reason, 162. Cannot admit of relaxation, 178. Its relation to the Atonement, 129.
Le Clerc on Abel's sacrifice, 209.
Levites, their office and functions, 30, 220.
Livy, passages from, illustrating the heathen opinions on sacrifice, 216.
Love of God, free and sovereign, the primary cause of salvation, 130.

MACLAURIN, John; his writings recommended, 57.
Magee, Archbishop; his work on *Atonement and Sacrifice*, 280.
Mankind, depraved and guilty state of, 177.
Mediator, the idea of, 96, 106, 110, 115.
Mercy of God, 45.
Messiah, term and office, 61.
Michaelis, Sir John David, on the Signification of Sacrifices, 28. On Heb. i. 3; 63. On the Priestly office of Christ, 79, 85, 119. On Rom. v. 6–11; 85. On sitting at the right hand, 89. On the Divine Nature of Christ, 93. On the term *sanctifying*, 94. On Heb. ix. 15–23; 107. On the *blood of sprinkling*, 111. On the *blood of the covenant*, 117. On the *corner-stone*, at the building of

the temple, 136. On Psalm cxix. 118; 148. On substitution, 187. On Abel's sacrifice, 210. On the early ideas of sacrifice, 197. On their origin, 197, 210, 214. On the order of the Levites, 219. On Prov. xiv. 6; 243. His interpretation of Is. liii. 10; 250. His version of that whole section of prophecy, 252. On the peculiarity of our Lord's sufferings, yet their agreeableness to reason, 295. On the O. T. types, 312.
Mitford, the historian of Greece; on the origin of sacrifices, 211.

Neologists of Germany; on their false and dangerous modes of interpreting the Scriptures, 146, 148–151, 153, 155, 240, 247.

Obligation to moral obedience, its reason and measure, 161.
Olshausen, on Acts xx. 28; 47.
Oxford Tracts for the Times; the author's opinion upon, 8, 193.

Pardon of sin, the bestowment of grace and righteousness, 70. It belongs to the province of the Divine Government, 129, 130. Its moral reason, 129.
Paul, the apostle; observations on his not citing Is. liii.; 238.
Pauli, C. W. H. on Is. liii.; 39.
Paulus, H. E. G., on the covenant and death of Christ, 106. On the Ep. to the Hebrews, 291.
Peirce, Rev. James, on Heb. vii. 27; 269.
Philo, on sacrifices, 223. On the High-Priest's entering the most holy place, 228. On the trespass-offerings, 231.
Priest and Priesthood; meaning of the terms, 29, 79, 82; and origin of the office, 29.
Priesthood, Levitical; its character and intention, 30. Its office and duty, 219.
——— of Christ; essential to Christianity, 79. Its character, real and efficient, 84, 87, 91. Not figurative, 145. Sole and unique, 121. Perfect, 122. Contrasted with the Levitical priesthood, 124, 268. Summary of its characteristic and pre-eminent properties, 141–144.
Priestley, Dr, his opinion upon the design of sacrifices, 20. Verbally allows the atonement of Christ, 84. On the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 204. On Matt. ix. 2, 6; 267.
Propitiation, 126, 294. Effected by Christ, 70.
Pseudo-Calvinistic notion with regard to the Moral Law, 164.
Punishment of sin, its nature, 130. Its necessity, 168, 170. Sustained by Jesus Christ, 45, 300.
Puysegur, Marq. de; on the origin of sacrifices, 217.
Pythagoræans, their doctrine concerning sacrifice, 218.

Randolph, Dr Thomas, on Ps. xl.; 32.
Ransom and Atonement, connexion of the ideas, 187, 293.
Reconciliation, effected by the sacrifice of Christ, 53, 126, 132.
Redemption, general or particular, 72, 327. The cause of holiness and good words, not their effect, 74. Origin and theological use of the term, 181, 183, 187.
Right of believers to divine blessings, whence it is derived, 132.
Righteousness of God, essential and necessary, 129.

Rosenmüller, sen. on Heb. i. 3; 63. On vii. 27; 268.
Rosenmüller, jun. on Abel's sacrifice, 210. His version of Is. liii.; 253–257.
Ryland, Dr, on Jer. xxx. 21, 22, and the reasonableness of the mediation of Christ, 100, 282.

SACRIFICE; defined, 19. Antiquity and extent of the practice, 20, 197. Origin of, 24, 204. Significancy of, 23, 25, 27. Heathen notions of, 25, 215, 233; Jewish notions of, 26. That the ancient sacrifices had no moral efficiency, 32, 124. That they were symbolical of the Messiah, as a victim to be immolated for mankind, 25, 31, 40, 45. Heathen practice of human sacrifices, 201. Levitical sacrifices, their various kinds, and the rites used in each, 200, 221–234. Design of, 18, 28, 221, 223, 229. Swept away by the hand of providence, 41.
Sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ; not so denominated in accommodation to Jewish predilections, 20, 40, 145. A real substitution, 46, 56, 59. Completed by his death, 122. Its value, 61. Its efficacy, 73, 125, 143. Its practical references, 52, 78.
Sacrifices; obedience of the faithful, why so called, 261.
Sacy, Le Maistre de; excellence of his translation of the Bible, 250.
Sanctification, a fruit of the sacrifice of Christ, 133.
Satisfaction, effected by the sufferings and death of Christ, 53. Its true import, 56, 262.
SAVIOUR, implications and importance of the epithet, 265; yet objected to by an anonymous Unitarian, 264.
Schaubach, Rev. E., on Christ as a *ransom*, 193.
Schleusner, on Heb. i. 3; 63.
Schultens on the term *Priest*, 80.
Seiler, Dr Geo. Fred., on Jer. xxx. 21, 22; 100. On the mischiefs of spurious criticism, 248. His high character as a Biblical interpreter, 250. His version of Is. liii.; 252–256.
Seneca, Marcus Annæus; his supposed intercourse with the Apostle Paul, 288.
Septuagint; its faulty character in relation to the translation of the prophets, 36, 98.
Simpson, Rev. David, *on the Deity of Christ*, recommended, 273.
Sin, defined, 166. Its unspeakable evil, 28, 42, 51, 53, 166, 168. Its necessary effects, 168, 173, 176.
Smith, Rev. George Vance, reply to his letters, 303; his interpretation of the N. T. doctrine of Justification, 305; objections to it, 306–325; its fundamental error, 308, 313.
Socinian hypothesis, with respect to the moral law, 164. Views of the sacrifice of Christ, 20, 204, 266.
Staël, the Baroness de; on the universal worship by sacrifice, 202.
Stapfer, John Fred. Prof. (of Berne, who died in 1775), on the idea of Satisfaction, 263.
Stewart, Prof. Dugald; on Causation, 259.
Stonard, Dr; on a prophecy of Daniel, 35. On the Vision of Zechariah, 236.
Strauss, Dav. Fred. his atheistic system, 156. I desire to add my recommendation of Dr Beard's learned and effective volume of Treatises, original and collected, in examination of Strauss's

Life of Jesus; and Dr Orlando T. Dobbin's Philological argument, Tentamen Anti-Straussianum: both recently published.
Stuart, American Prof., on the Ep. to the Hebrews, 144, 286.
Substitution of Christ for mankind, 45, 58, 295.
Sufferings of Christ; their peculiar character, 50–52, 67. Their awfulness and intensity, 49. Incapable of being rationally accounted for, if their expiatory design be rejected, 51. Their consistency with Divine Justice, 57–59.
Symbols, ancient use of, 22.
Symington, Dr. Wm.; on the extent of the Atonement, 274.

TARGUM of Jonathan, on Is. liii.; 36.
Taylor, Isaac; his Lectures on Spiritual Christianity, 60.
Tertullian, on satisfaction as effected by Christ, 263.
Threatening from God, what, 130.
Tittmann, Charles Chr., on the character and tendency of the modern innovations on theology in Germany, 149. His character and works, 154.
——— Joh. Aug. Hen., on Ps. xl. 6; 32. His character and works, 154.
Translations, utility of comparing, 249.

UNCHANGEABLENESS of God, not violated by the doctrine of Atonement, 128, 131.
Union of Christ with his people, 58, 71, 132.

VAN ESS, Dr Leander; his ability and felicity as a Bible translator, 63.
Van Wynpersse, Dr; on the Divinity of Christ, recommended, 272.

WALFORD, Rev. Wm.; his version of the Ep. to the Romans, 308. I beg to add a cordial recommendation of it.
Wardlaw's, Dr, Discourses on the Socinian Controversy, recommended, 273. On the Atonement, recommended, 280.
Weigand, on Gal. iii. 20; 103.
Williams, Dr Edw., on the extent of the atonement, 276.
Winer's account of the classes and modes of the Levitical sacrifices, 220–234.
Wisdom of God, in the constitution of redemption, 44.
Wolzogenius on Is. liii. 4; 243.

FINIS.

MURRAY AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library

1 1012 01006 5151

DATE DUE

NOV 18 2009

HIGHSMITH #45115